

MIKHAIL BULGAKOV: THE THEME
OF EVIL IN MASTER I MARGARITA

Riitta H. Pittman

Ph. D.

University of Edinburgh

1985



DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis, 'Mikhail Bulgakov:
the theme of evil in Master i Margarita', has been
composed by me and is my own work.

Signed: _____
Riitta H. Pittman

Date: 2. 9. 1985

CONTENTS

	Page No.
Preface	(vi)
Abstract	(vii)
Introduction	1.
I <u>Vekhi</u> - ideological background	6.
1. Introduction	7.
2. Loss of spirituality	8.
3. Utilitarian faith - atheism	14.
4. Man-godhood	20 .
5. Split personality	24.
6. Attitude to ordinary people	29.
7. Good and evil	31.
8. Conclusion	33.
II Woland's genealogy	35.
1. Introduction	36.
2. Arrogance	36.
3. Man willing evil	38.
4. The devil's likeness	39.
5. The devil's influence	42.
6. In support of the irrational fact	48.
III The devil in Moscow	53.
1. Introduction	54.
2. The devil and the unconscious	55.
2.1 Introduction	55.

	Page No.
2.2 The devil as an aspect of the protagonists' personalities	57.
2.3 Dreams, memory and hallucinations	58.
2.4 Dreams and myth-making	64.
2.5 The devil as a manifestation of the irrational	67.
2.5.1 Introduction	67.
2.5.2 The spirit of negation	68.
2.5.3 Man-god <u>versus</u> God-man	71.
2.6 God-image	74.
2.7 Knowledge	77.
2.8 Revelation of myth	83.
2.9 <u>Deo concedente</u>	85.
3. The devil and the ordinary citizens of Moscow	88.
3.1 Introduction	88.
3.2 The housing problem	90.
3.3 People love money	93.
3.4 Mystery of black magic and witchcraft revealed	97.
3.5 Contract with the devil: N. I. Bosoi	103.
4. Conclusion	111.
IV Writer <u>versus</u> society	117.
1. Introduction: the theme of the double	118.
2. Art and life	120.
3. Ivan's schizophrenia	123.
4. The Master	129.
5. Recovery	132.
6. Reasoning in a circle	139.

	Page No.
V The devil's domain	142.
1. Introduction	143.
2. The 'fifth dimension'	143.
2.1 Location	143.
2.2 Satan's Ball/Griboyedov party	148.
2.3 Reality and fantasy of legends	154.
2.4 Life on earth from the devil's viewpoint	159.
3. Heroine	162.
3.1 Margarita's spiritual quality	162.
3.2 Margarita and the love story	167.
3.3 Margarita as a witch	175.
VI The Pontius Pilate story	180.
1. Introduction	181.
2. Man <u>versus</u> power	182.
3. Pontius Pilate	187.
3.1 Pontius Pilate's personality and outlook	187.
3.2 Jeshua's influence	189.
3.3 Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem	192.
4. Jeshua Na-Notsri	197.
4.1 Jeshua in Jerusalem	197.
5. Pontius Pilate <u>versus</u> Jeshua	200.
6. Good and evil as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'	203.
7. Faith and fear	209.
8. Conclusion	212.

	Page No.
Conclusion	215.
Notes	219.
Selective bibliography	234.

PREFACE

The transliteration system of the Royal Society, generally known as the British system, is used in this thesis to convey the titles of books, articles, essays and chapter headings. The spelling of the characters' names and also of place names as they occur in Master i Margarita is based on the usage adopted in M. Glenny's translation of the novel (London, 1967). All Russian quotations are given in the Cyrillic alphabet and the old orthography has been modernised.

The Soviet edition of M. A. Bulgakov's Romany. Belaya gvardiya. Teatral'nyy roman. Master i Margarita. (published in 1978) is used as the primary source for this study and quotations from this text are referred to by page number only. Similarly, quotations from Vekhi (Moscow, 1909) and Brat'ya Karamazovy (Petrozavodsk, 1970) are indicated by page number only. Page references, particularly in connection with the first two chapters of this thesis, refer not only to specific quotations but serve as a more general guide to locating the source information relating to the discussion in progress.

As regards Vekhi, particular attention is given in this thesis to the essays of N. A. Berdyaev, Sergei Bulgakov, M. O. Gershenzon and S. L. Frank.

Finally, I am grateful to the members of the Edinburgh University Russian Department who have generously given their time and invaluable advice and thus greatly aided the task of completing this work.

ABSTRACT

Mikhail Bulgakov's preoccupation with evil in Master i Margarita is set against the background of spiritual barrenness which is outlined in the essays of Vekhi (1909) as dominating Russian radical thought at the beginning of the 20th century. The themes of loss of spirituality, utilitarian faith or atheism, man-godhood, split personality, lack of faith in people and ethical inaptitude, as depicted in Vekhi, re-emerge in Bulgakov's novel more than two decades after the publication of the essays.

The devil's genealogy is examined in relation to the sources which Bulgakov is known to have used while writing the novel. The study of the devil's role reveals that, in the case of the conformist characters, Woland appears as a manifestation of the irrational and metaphysical aspects of existence while, in the case of the ordinary Moscow citizens, he advocates a more common sense, rational attitude to life than that which relies on magic and witchcraft.

The writer's dilemma in a philistine, authoritarian society is examined through the phenomenon of split personality (Ivan Bezdomny versus the Master).

Throughout the thesis C. G. Jung's ideas are employed to illustrate how Bulgakov shapes the myth which gives meaning to the life of a writer whose work might never be published. The Pontius Pilate story is shown to contain the philosophical kernel of the novel; in accordance with Jungian ideology moral absolutes are conceived by Bulgakov, not as opposites, but as part of a paradoxical whole. The joint immortality of Pontius Pilate and Jeshua serves as a most explicit metaphor of this view which is echoed in Woland's question: what would happen to good if there were no evil?

Yet, as a whole Master i Margarita must be seen to demonstrate that there may be justification, but there is no consolation, for a person who turns away from truth.

INTRODUCTION

Mikhail Bulgakov's Master i Margarita¹ is considered in this thesis as an account of the author's preoccupation with evil. The novel depicts life in a society which has forsaken God and seeks only to satisfy its materialist and rationalist side. An attempt will be made to show that the novel reflects Bulgakov's phantasmagoric view of the hollowness which defines human existence if the questions of good and evil, of truth and falsehood are determined exclusively according to a dogmatic outlook on life.

The intellectual background to the evil of spiritual paralysis by which Soviet society is affected in Master i Margarita is outlined with reference to a collection of essays entitled Vekhi² (published in 1909). It is argued that the conditions of which Vekhi's essayists warned the intellectual leaders of their society at the beginning of this century have become reality in the Moscow depicted by Bulgakov: the pursuit of utilitarian aims has wholly replaced any preoccupation with the metaphysical aspects of human life; corrupt materialism prevails and latent spiritual energy - inherent in the Russian mentality - finds unnatural channels of outflow. The conception of man-godhood marks the culmination of the process in the course of which Soviet society has become afflicted by the paralysis of its spiritual life.

The devil plays a leading part in the revelation of the truth about evil in Master i Margarita. Thus it seems appropriate that his genealogy should be studied in some detail particularly in relation to those reference works which Bulgakov is known to have used while writing the novel. The study of the devil's genealogy shows that although the devil stands at the very centre of Bulgakov's preoccupation with evil he is not an evil character. It is made

clear as early as in the novel's epigraph that Bulgakov wishes to make a connection between Goethe's devil and his own novel. It will be argued in this thesis that Mephistopheles' words can be applied to Woland who also wills evil and does good in Master i Margarita.

In this context it will be illustrated how the truth about evil, as it concerns the characters and their society, is unveiled in Bulgakov's work through the devil's agency. On the one hand, i.e. in the case of the conformist literary characters, the devil is seen representing the suppressed aspects of the characters' lives, primarily the irrational region of their sensibility. In this connection considerable reference will be made to C. G. Jung's ideas which help to illuminate the devil's function in the novel's thematic development. Ivan Karamazov's devil will also be evoked in connection with the study of Woland's influence as a spirit of negation. On the other hand, in the case of the ordinary Moscow citizens the devil is viewed as an advocate of a more common-sense attitude to life than is displayed by the people's unquestioning belief in magic and witchcraft.

The theme of artist versus society is examined through the symptoms of Ivan Bezdomny's schizophrenia, which the devil predicts in the opening chapter of the novel. The characters of Ivan Bezdomny and the Master are shown to parallel one another in many ways and it will be argued that they can be seen as different aspects of a writer's divided personality: Ivan represents his public persona while the Master stands for his individual, creative self. The conflict between life and art which emerges from the division of the writer's personality is thus considered as part of the general malady - the evil of spiritual paralysis - by which Soviet society has become affected. An attempt will be made to show that the devil also partakes in the revelation of evil as it affects the artist in a

philistine society: in Ivan's schizophrenia the suppressed, paralysed aspect of his personality, his creative instinct, is revived through the Master's appearance to him.

In the novel both the Master and Margarita are shown to be closely connected with the devil's dimension which relates at once to the material reality of Moscow and the immaterial plane of being. On the devil's 'fifth dimension' time and space may be altered to any desired degree. Thus free of temporal and physical restrictions Woland's domain is full of possibilities which serve both to bring life on the material plane into a sharper focus (e.g. the episodes relating to the chess-game and the living globe)³ and to provide a gateway for a flight of fantasy such as is manifest, for instance, in Margarita becoming a witch and a queen of Satan's Ball. In connection with the study of the 'fifth dimension' reference will be made to P. Florensky's understanding of fictitious parallels in geometry⁴ as it is known that Bulgakov was fascinated with Florensky's ideas while constructing the cosmology of his novel.

It is maintained in this thesis that the Pontius Pilate story contains the philosophical kernel of Master i Margarita. In it uncompromising truth is given expression through Jeshua's character. However, it will be argued that in the story this truth becomes inextricably bound up in a paradox when it is set against Pontius Pilate's predicament in Jerusalem. It will be illustrated that the characters of the Procurator and the vagrant form a synthesis in which the moral absolutes of good and evil are reflected as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'⁵. Furthermore, it will be shown that the joint immortality which the two protagonists attain in the story rests upon this paradoxical understanding of the moral absolutes. Good and evil are examined in relation to the degree to which the

protagonists' moral choices are made freely or out of necessity.

As a whole, the Pontius Pilate story is viewed as Bulgakov's creation of a myth in a language of his own age for the purpose of depicting the moral dilemma which affects an artist living in a dogmatic, philistine society.

To sum up Bulgakov's preoccupation with evil, as realised in Master i Margarita, this thesis attempts to show that the novel relates how in a godless society - paradoxically - the devil appears as the saviour of God's image in man.

CHAPTER ONE:

Vekhi - ideological background

1. Introduction

Master i Margarita¹ is considered in this thesis as a philosophical work in which Bulgakov depicts 'the partial destruction and partial adaptation of the Russian intelligentsia to the post-Revolutionary order'². Consequently, it seems appropriate that the dominant characteristics of the ideological background from which this work emerges should be outlined at the beginning of this thesis. An important collection of essays entitled Vekhi³, which was published in 1909, is used here for this purpose.

Vekhi is a publicist work which was aimed at dissolving the alliances - born out of the intelligentsia's radicalism at the turn of this century - between atheism and progress on the one hand and between religion and political reaction on the other. Vekhi's contributors are connected with a movement, which began well before 1905, inspired by V. Solov'ev and inclined to identify liberalism with Christian idealism⁴. Although it must be emphasised here that Master i Margarita does not advocate Christian idealism in any sense, it is possible to see the novel as part of the spiritual revival which began with certain intellectuals seeking to resist the attempts of the radical intelligentsia to replace culture with utility and in connection with which Dostoevsky's influence must not be underestimated. In other words, the evil with which Bulgakov is pre-occupied in his novel may be traced to the same source as the evil against which the Christian liberals who contributed essays to Vekhi sought to warn their intellectual brothers.

The contributors to Vekhi were all highly esteemed thinkers and the work has gained much authority as an indication of the disillusionment with which the majority of the intelligentsia was

regarded by some of its own members after the 1905 Revolution.

It is necessary to emphasise the fact that the essays of Vekhi must be seen as the intelligentsia's indictment of itself, i.e. in them the contributors seek to present a self-critical analysis of the malady by which they saw the intelligentsia becoming infected.

Although Vekhi predates Bulgakov's literary activity connected with Master i Margarita by almost two decades, its significance as an accurate seismograph of the tremors which came to shake Moscow in the 1930's makes the collection extremely valid from the point of view of this thesis. In general, the collection of essays contained in Vekhi must be considered as an open plea made in support of spirituality and individuality in Russian society. The contributors were seeking to arrest the Russian intelligentsia in its blind march towards materialism and utilitarianism.

In his novel Bulgakov depicts a materialist society in which the search for philosophical truth has been replaced by a concerted effort to implement and maintain 'socialist reality'⁵. It is against such a society that the contributors to Vekhi sought to issue a warning. The first chapter of this thesis aims to provide an outline of the intellectual and philosophical background to which Bulgakov's Master i Margarita may be traced. It does not aim to present a summary of the key ideas contained in the essays of Vekhi but it seeks to focus attention on the arguments which can be seen reflected in the themes of Bulgakov's work.

2. Loss of spirituality

The overall purpose of this thesis is to show that in Master i Margarita the devil is employed by Bulgakov for the task of joining together the severed pieces in which God's image in man is revealed.

Loss of spirituality emerges as a primary cause for the disintegration of this image in a society where materialism and spirituality have been separated from corporate existence and the former has come to triumph at the expense of the latter. In Bulgakov's novel *Berlioz*, the conformist editor, embraces and advocates the kind of ideas against which Vekhi's contributors sought to warn the intellectuals of their time. In his work Bulgakov shows that these ideas have come to dominate the intellectual climate of Moscow in the 1930's. *Berlioz* is a public personality; he belongs to the ranks of the 'official' intelligentsia. He adheres meticulously to the dictates of the materialist and rationalist dogma and, with haughty complacency, he seeks to enlighten the young poet *Bezdomny* who has accidentally or instinctively wandered into the mythical reality of the New Testament through his vivid portrayal of Jesus Christ. Vekhi's contributors were highly aware of the threat contained in the loss of spirituality which was characteristic of intellectual thinking at the turn of this century. The way in which this loss had come about is now illustrated through the examination of those sections of Vekhi which provide illumination of Bulgakov's depiction of this depraved condition in Master i Margarita.

Mikhail Bulgakov's uncle, Sergei Bulgakov contributed to Vekhi an essay entitled 'Geroizm i podvizhnichestvo'⁶ from which it is apparent that a feeling of anxiety had arisen amongst the serious thinkers at the beginning of this century about the fact that the Russian intelligentsia seemed to have lost its sense of sinfulness:

Она [интеллигенция] уверовала, вместе с Руссо и со всем просветительством, что естественный человек добр по природе своей и что учение о первородном грехе и коренной порче человеческой природы есть суеверный миф,...

(51)

That is - as claimed by a newspaper article in 1909⁷ - the radical intelligentsia must be seen as Ivan Karamazov's disciples who, having rejected the superstitious myth of the Fall and the Original Sin, had advanced even further in their journey in the direction of Self than was the case with their intellectual progenitor:

Даже ... Иван Карамазов, путем логических выкладок решивший самую страшную формулу жизни ("если нет Бога, то я - Бог"), даже этот отцеубийца и наперсник дьявола, не отважился обожествить свою личность иначе, как условно: *если нет Бога ...*

Митинговые ораторы наших дней не скажут, подобно Ивану Карамазову, "если нет Бога", а скажут: "*так как нет Бога ...*"⁸

Thus the intelligentsia had, according to this article, arrived at a stage which marks the culmination of man's arrogance and self-idolatry:

... в современном самообожествлении уже нет и намека на грусть и злость ... а только размеренное и тупое, как ход маятника, сознание своего превосходства.⁹

The above quotations help to define the background against which the intelligentsia's loss of spirituality - as seen by Vekhi's contributors at the beginning of the 20th century - may be traced.

Because arrogance and self-idolatry dominated intellectual thinking and because the intelligentsia had turned away from God, the pursuit of true philosophical enquiry became seriously threatened. Thus Vekhi's contributors claim that the intelligentsia rejected its true mission as it turned away from philosophical enquiry and devoted itself wholly to the realisation of utilitarian aims. N. Berdyaev's essay¹⁰ reveals how deeply the few traditional thinkers had been disillusioned by the majority of the intelligentsia which had become indifferent to the philosophical truth:

Интеллигенцию не интересует вопрос, истинна или ложна,

например, теория знания Маха, ее интересует лишь то, благоприятна или нет эта теория идее социализма, послужит ли она благу и интересам пролетариата; ее интересует не то, возможна ли метафизика и существуют ли метафизические истины, а то лишь, не повредит ли метафизика интересам народа, не отвлечет ли от борьбы с самодержавием и от служения пролетариату. (6)

In Berdyaev's view the intelligentsia had no interest in ideas and questions for themselves. They were only interested in how these ideas related to socialist dogma, i.e. whether they served to strengthen or weaken the teachings of this ideology. In Bulgakov's novel this attitude is most clearly illustrated in the opening chapter of the work where Berlioz, the senior editor and a pillar of the establishment, confidently dismisses Ivan Bezdomny's depiction of Jesus Christ. The editor is not interested in what Jesus was like as a man; he is only interested in showing that Jesus had never existed at all, as demanded by the official dogma.

Berlioz and Bezdomny - the latter with some reservations - are endowed with the kind of mentality which Berdyaev attributes to that section of the intelligentsia whose behaviour he saw as being guided by the so-called 'Catholic psychology'¹¹. Berdyaev defines the tenets of this psychology of hatred and indifference in relation to the intelligentsia's attitude towards the idealistic and religious aspects of philosophy as follows:

Интеллигенция готова принять на веру всякую философию под тем условием, чтобы она санкционировала ее социальные идеалы, и без критики отвергнет всякую, самую глубокую и истинную философию, если она будет заподозрена в неблагоприятном и просто критическом отношении к этим традиционным настроениям и идеалам. (6-7)

Berdyaev asserts further that a particular kind of morality arises from the kind of intellectual thinking described above:

Общественный утилитаризм в оценках всего, поклонение "народу", - то крестьянству, то пролетариату, - все это остается моральным догматом большей части интеллигенции. (7)

In terms of this new morality the questions of good and evil, guilt and innocence, cowardice and heroism are measured against the yardstick of usefulness to society and the people.

In Master i Margarita the conformist literary characters display symptoms of this 'Catholic psychology' through their narrow-minded adherence to the official dogma. The morality which they preach - i.e. right and wrong are determined according to whether they are sanctioned by this dogma - is shown by Bulgakov to be undermined by magic and superstitious beliefs which are rampant amidst the Moscow citizens. The questions of responsibility for evil are conveniently avoided by the people through reference to witchcraft and other supernatural forces whose influence remains beyond man's control.

For Berdyaev the whole of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor concept stands for the malady which underlies the utilitarianism of the Russian intelligentsia. It is in Ivan Karamazov's legend of the Grand Inquisitor that 'the Catholic psychology' is depicted most vividly. In it narrow dogmatism lights up the fires and erects the stakes on which heretics burn for the cause of human happiness on this earth. The legend reveals Dostoevsky's acute awareness of the dangers inherent in the Roman Catholic Church that has become State, as regards individual freedom and respect for human beings. With reference to the legend Berdyaev states that the majority of the Russian intelligentsia had been overcome by spiritual dearth:

... любовь к уравнительной справедливости, к общественному добру, к народному благу парализовала любовь к истине, почти что уничтожила интерес к истине.

Она [интеллигенция] шла на соблазн великого инквизитора, который требовал отказа от истины во имя счастья людей.
(8)

Berdyaev sees the majority of his fellow intellectuals taking upon

themselves the burden of the Grand Inquisitor: seeking to bring material happiness to people while ignoring their spiritual needs. Berdyaev's analysis of the spiritual dearth by which he sees the intellectual leaders of his time becoming affected is highly relevant to Bulgakov's exploration of the same dilemma in Moscow in the 1930's. This thesis attempts to show that in a sense Master i Margarita can be seen as a 'book of revelations' because in it Bulgakov seeks to uncover the truth about evil which has become buried under the morass of the official dogma. The devil is conjured up by Bulgakov for the purpose of revealing the mystery in which life in Moscow has become shrouded, ironically, under the rule of the city's materialist and rationalist 'high priests'.

In Bulgakov's novel Berlioz is engaged to control literature. That is, he measures literary works against a yardstick which records each work's value in relation to the official ideology. Bezdomny's depiction of Jesus Christ has fallen below the acceptable standard in this measurement. Berlioz distrusts the people's ability to walk along the correct ideological path without the guidance of strict censorship. In Vekhi Berdyaev claims that at the beginning of the century the intelligentsia was seriously lacking in genuine respect for man; that is, the majority of its members seemed to have lost their faith in people¹². Consequently, the cause of material happiness in which these members of the intelligentsia were deeply involved came to be founded on false love for mankind. Berlioz's dismissal of Bezdomny's work is a particular manifestation of the way in which such false love operates in a society characterised by spiritual dearth. The consequences of the Grand Inquisitor phenomenon are defined by Berdyaev in religious terms as follows:

Оказалось, что ложно направленное человеколюбие убивает боголюбие, так как любовь к истине, как к красоте, как и к всякой абсолютной ценности, есть выражение любви к Божеству. (8)

The essence of Berdyaev's lament on the condition of his intellectual brothers is contained in an argument put forward by him in passionate defence of God's image in man:

Подлинная же любовь к людям есть любовь не против истины и Бога, а в истине и в Боге, не жалость, отрицающая достоинство человека, а признание родного Божьего образа в каждом человеке. (9)

Neither compassion, nor pity, nor worship, when steeped in the doctrines of utilitarianism, take account of the divinity manifest in every human being as all of them fail to recognise God's image in man.

In Master i Margarita the Pontius Pilate story represents a further dimension of the spiritual barrenness to which Berdyaev refers: the Procurator's lack of faith in people shows how the condition of spiritual depravity confines the individual within a vacuum in which fear eats his soul. However, it is possible to conclude the discussion on lack of spirituality in Russian society on a more positive note with reference to the fact that in Bulgakov's work Ivan Bezdomny's 'erroneous' portrayal of Jesus Christ bears witness to the vitality of the image of God which has not yet been drowned in the sea of materialism and rationalism.

3. Utilitarian faith - atheism

Thus far the outline of utilitarianism as adopted by the Russian intelligentsia has focused on the lack of spirituality inherent in this ideology. It has been noted that Berdyaev considers the absence of respect for man and faith in people as the most dangerous features of this utilitarianism. In order to acquire some understanding of the kind of extremism characteristic of Berlioz' and

Bezdomny's defence of their society's official ideology it is necessary to discuss in more detail the non-material aspects of utilitarianism, i.e. the utilitarian faith, to which both Berdyaev and Sergei Bulgakov see the intelligentsia of their time persistently adhering. Furthermore, the susceptibility of even the more educated Moscow citizens to the mystery of black magic in Master i Margarita may at least partly be traced to the paradox which, according to these thinkers, was apparent in the intelligentsia's attitude towards the cause it sought to advance at the time of the publication of Vekhi.

Berdyaev asserts that due to historical circumstances the temperament of the Russian intelligentsia was not capable of embracing the concepts of objectivity and universalism¹³. It was primarily concerned with the struggle against autocracy and service to the people; questions and ideas of an eternal nature remained outside its sphere of interest. In its fervent pursuit of these two primary aims the intelligentsia was inspired by something that may only be called a religion or a faith. Thus, paradoxically, the intelligentsia became religious in its anti-religiousness and its members became believers in their very denial of faith. Berdyaev supports this claim by maintaining that 'рационализм сознания сочетался с исключительной эмоциональностью и с слабостью самоценной умственной жизни' (9). This rationalism, imbued with emotion and lacking in intellect, was evident, for example, in the Russian intelligentsia's attitude towards scientific positivism:

Дух научного позитивизма сам по себе не исключает никакой метафизики и никакой религиозной веры. Мы же под научным позитивизмом всегда понимали радикальное отрицание всякой метафизики и всякой религиозной веры, или, точнее, научный позитивизм был для нас тождествен с материалистической метафизикой и социально-революционной верой.

Запад создал научный дух, который и там был превращен в орудие борьбы против религии и метафизики. Но Западу чужды славянские крайности; Запад создал науку религиозно и метафизически нейтральную. (11)

The kind of extremism to which Berdyaev considers the intelligentsia susceptible can be seen as the root of the kind of 'materialist metaphysics' with which Mikhail Bulgakov is concerned in Master i Margarita.

In Bulgakov's work the devil is assigned to challenge the materialist and rationalist outlook on life which is propounded by the official ideology in Moscow. This challenge is presented in a manner which makes the term of 'materialist metaphysics' apply to Bulgakov's novel in its most literary - almost pedantic - meaning. By means of reasoning in a circle - i.e. 'assuming what is to be proved as the basis of the argument'¹⁴ - Bulgakov makes metaphysical ideas manifest in the material reality of Moscow. For example, the devil's existence is proved by his arrival in Moscow. As a result of this technique the paradox which is seen by Berdyaev in Vekhi as being characteristic of the Russian intelligentsia's attitude towards its mission emerges in Master i Margarita, 'for example, through the depiction of the naive and narrow-minded mentality of Berlioz and Bezdomny in the very first chapters of the work. Throughout the novel Bulgakov implies repeatedly that the threat which ensues from this kind of mentality holds the stability of the Moscow society on a knife edge. In the course of the revelation of the mystery of black magic in the novel (a process which is not confined to the events at the Variety Theatre performance) the weaknesses inherent in this paradox are uncovered and the city is overcome by chaos and disorder.

Like Berdyaev, Sergei Bulgakov also acknowledges that the Russian atheism was characterised by a peculiarly religious extremism:

... в духовном облике русской интеллигенции имеются черты религиозности, иногда приближающиеся даже к христианской.
(27-28)

To illustrate the paradoxical nature of the radical intelligentsia's atheism Sergei Bulgakov employs religious vocabulary to outline the tenets of its ideology:

Известная неотмирность, эсхатологическая мечта о Граде Божием, о грядущем царстве правды (под разными социалистическими псевдонимами) и затем стремление к спасению человечества - если не от греха, то от страданий - ...
(29)

Thus Sergei Bulgakov claims that the echo of religious thought was clearly detectable in the dogma advocated by the radical intelligentsia. While in Vekhi this intelligentsia is endowed with religious inclination, in Master i Margarita Jeshua, the prototype of the New Testament religion, is transformed into a political offender who has a profound understanding of the metaphysical aspects of being and, yet, is totally devoid of any religious or mythical qualities. However, the complexities of this paradox emerge fully only when the vagrant's predicament is juxtaposed with the political realities circumscribing life in Jerusalem.

In Bulgakov's novel the reasons for the senior editor's vehement denial of the existence of Jesus Christ are connected with the reasons for the Russian intelligentsia's apparent rejection of religion as explained in Vekhi. Sergei Bulgakov states that the Russian intelligentsia regarded education and enlightenment synonymous with religious indifference¹⁵. In this connection it must be emphasised that in Master i Margarita Jeshua's character does not stand specifically or even more generally in opposition to religious indifference. Rather, he stands in support of the truth as it concerns the metaphysical dimension of human existence. Sergei Bulgakov explains in Vekhi how the Russian intelligentsia came to

turn away from the contemplation of the truth.

It is ironic that the Russian intelligentsia - as Sergei Bulgakov asserts - adopted its negative attitude to religion, not through persistent intellectual enquiry, but by simply professing adherence to the belief that religion was incompatible with enlightenment. It was readily assumed that science would resolve finally all religious questions and thus religion would be naturally cast aside. In this context the intelligentsia also turned away from philosophy - and, in particular, from metaphysics. In Master i Margarita Berlioz refers to scholarly study for the purpose of proving that Jesus Christ had never existed. He also claims confidently that no evidence of God's existence can be found in the realm of reason. Similarly, Sergei Bulgakov writes, all classes of people (not just the members of the intelligentsia) came to agree on the view that science and progress would make religion redundant. The new rationalist and materialist 'faith' remained unchallenged because it was adopted so readily and unanimously by the majority of the people that only a kind of mass hypnosis could be suggested as a possible explanation for its extraordinary occurrence. Sergei Bulgakov envisages that once consolidated this new 'faith' would be upheld by 'lay priests' who would be required to maintain a strong prejudice in favour of the official ideology¹⁶.

In Master i Margarita Mikhail Bulgakov demonstrates that the mould formulated by Sergei Bulgakov in Vekhi fits admirably for the casting of the Russian atheists who exist in Moscow in the 1930's. The novel reveals how the narrow dogmatism inherent in the official ideology makes the behaviour of the Moscow society's intellectual leaders laughable in its naivety. This naivety is

shown to ensue from the paucity of thought characteristic of the ideas in support of which, in particular, Berlioz and Bezdomny argue. In Vekhi Sergei Bulgakov explains that historical circumstances were responsible for this kind of intellectual shallowness. In his essay he deals specifically with the shallowness typical of Russian atheism. Sergei Bulgakov states that

В русском атеизме больше всего поражает его догматизм, то, можно сказать, религиозное легкомыслие, с которым он принимается. (32)

He points out emphatically that since the Russian intelligentsia acquired its atheist ideas from the West it was deceived in its belief that alongside atheism it would obtain the whole of the authentic European civilisation. Sergei Bulgakov acknowledges that, of course, a regeneration of a single idea, i.e. atheism, into a complex multiplicity of ideas, i.e. culture or civilisation, is impossible in soil which is utterly lacking in the other ingredients that make up the rest of Western culture. Because of this misconceived adoption of atheism from the West the Russian intelligentsia is seen by Sergei Bulgakov as having arrived at a further serious misconception:

Наша интеллигенция по отношению к религии просто еще не вышла из отроческого возраста, она еще не думала серьезно о религии и не дала себе сознательного религиозного самоопределения, она не жила еще религиозной мыслью и остается поэтому, строго говоря, не выше религии, как думает о себе сама, но вне религии¹⁶. (32)

The arrogant self-confidence with which Berlioz and Bezdomny extol the superiority of the narrow-minded ideology whose adherents they proudly proclaim to be bears evidence to the fact that Mikhail Bulgakov has diagnosed symptoms of this same misconception in the citizens of his society and time.

4. Man-godhood

The question of who controls man's life is explicitly posed twice in Master i Margarita and is implicitly suggested throughout the novel. In the opening chapter Bezdomny informs the devil impatiently that man himself controls his own life. In the Jerusalem section of the novel Pontius Pilate reminds his prisoner that the decision upon the offender's life rests within the Procurator's power. In each case the misconceived arrogance of these characters is deflated by the author. In Vekhi Sergei Bulgakov examines the ideas contained in this kind of arrogant approach to life and how these ideas culminated in the formulation of the concept of man's godhood¹⁷.

At the beginning of this chapter some reference was made to Sergei Bulgakov's concern for the fact that the Russian intelligentsia seemed to have discarded the ideas of the Fall and Original Sin as it grasped the belief that man is naturally good. Sergei Bulgakov traces this belief to the hedonism inherent in the culture of classical Antiquity. According to him certain aspects of classical hedonism were revived through a renewed interest in the world of Antiquity which had occurred in connection with the advent of the Reformation and the renaissance of humanism that followed in its wake:

Параллельно с религиозным индивидуализмом реформации усиливался и нео-языческий индивидуализм, возвеличивавший натурального, невозрожденного человека. По этому воззрению, человек добр и прекрасен по своей природе, которая искажается лишь внешними условиями; достаточно восстановить естественное состояние человека, и этим будет все достигнуто.
(34)

In Sergei Bulgakov's view the very essence of modern humanism and the ensuing socialist ideology - as manifest in Russian intellectual thought - were derived from the conviction that the whole tragedy of

humanity can be resolved through external reforms. Throughout his essay the writer's close affinity with the Slavophiles can be clearly detected. Essentially, Sergei Bulgakov aims to demonstrate that the Russian intelligentsia was misguided in its adoption of Western ideas which were fundamentally alien to its native mentality. That is why the intelligentsia, endowed with Russian propensity for spirituality became religious in its very atheism and denial of faith. Furthermore, this is partly why the idea of man's godhood came into being. A further reason for the conception of this idea can be found, according to Sergei Bulgakov, in the belief that humanity could reach a state of perfection through the implementation of external reforms which remained entirely within man's power to achieve.

Sergei Bulgakov explains that the acceptance of the argument which states that man is naturally perfect, that limitless progress is achievable through human effort and that mechanical understanding of this progress is accessible to man presupposes that all evil ensues from external circumstances. Thus man is relieved from feeling any responsibility for evil. By limitless progress Sergei Bulgakov refers to the assumption that man was omnipotent in his ability to correct external circumstances through reform in order that humanity might proceed towards its - presumably original - state of perfection. In a sense this can be seen as man's desire to assume the place of Providence since man is in this way seeking to act as his own Saviour. In Sergei Bulgakov's view herein lies the essence of the doctrine of man-godhood to which the utilitarian section of the Russian intelligentsia so vehemently adhered. The writer points out that the concept of heroism is closely connected with this doctrine:

Героизм - ... выражает, ... основную сущность интеллигентского мировоззрения и идеала, притом героизм самообожения. Вся экономия ее душевных сил основана на этом самочувствии. (37)

The intelligentsia saw itself as the only possible Saviour of Russia and, at times, even of all mankind. Ironically, however, this kind of intellectual heroism arrested the radical intelligentsia's concern for humanity in general because it shrouded its heroes in an atmosphere of exclusiveness:

Кто жил в интеллигентских кругах, хорошо знает это высокомерие и самомнение, сознание своей непогрешимости и пренебрежение к инакомыслящим, и этот отвлеченный догматизм, в который отливается здесь всякое учение. (41)

Such exclusiveness as described by Sergei Bulgakov above parallels closely Mikhail Bulgakov's depiction of the arrogant selectiveness which characterises the social behaviour of the establishment characters in Master i Margarita. Just as Sergei Bulgakov shows in his essay that immaturity and lack of vision underlay the air of self-confidence and self-satisfaction which the revolutionary, utilitarian heroes of his time had assumed, so Mikhail Bulgakov reveals in his novel that in Moscow of the 1930's naivety and ignorance are disguised under the veneer of ideological competence and scientific scholarship on which the superiority of the novel's conformist 'heroes' depends.

Sergei Bulgakov's bitter comment on the intellectual arrogance of the radical wing of the Russian intelligentsia as it existed at the turn of the century concludes this discussion on heroism:

... остается сигнатурой целой исторической полосы и всего душевного уклада интеллигентского героизма, что идеал христианского святого, подвижника здесь сменился образом революционного студента. (44)

In this context it is useful to recall that in Mikhail Bulgakov's novel a similar role change has taken place between the characters of

Berlioz and Jeshua; the former is presented in the novel as a spiritual leader who offers guidance to disciples like Bezdomny; the latter is branded as a political offender by the ruling establishment of his society. Thus while Sergei Bulgakov draws attention to the way in which a revolutionary student came to be endowed with the attributes of a Christian saint by the radical intelligentsia at the turn of the century, Mikhail Bulgakov suggests in his novel how in the Moscow of the 1930's Christ could be turned into a threatening political figure.

Sergei Bulgakov's essay finishes on a note of optimism because he sees the intelligentsia, despite its temporary misguided adherence to the teachings of the Anti-Christ, being capable of starting anew. The radical intelligentsia's high religious potential is compared by Sergei Bulgakov to a new raft of history which is waiting to be swept into motion by inspiration¹⁸. This inspiration would resurrect the intelligentsia from the 'religious suicide' which it had committed when it turned away from Christ and sought to erase the true Saviour's image from its consciousness. The theologian remains convinced that the intelligentsia would be saved, because its members could not continue to ignore their irresistible yearning for transcendental truth. Once reborn with a new soul the intelligentsia would come to recognise the personal, individual responsibility through which it could meaningfully partake in the task of aiding humanity's progress - only this time not acting as Providence, but acting in His name.

In Mikhail Bulgakov's work inspiration is manifest in Margarita's character. With the devil's help she leads the Master through a series of resurrections which mark different stages of his

journey towards death. It can be argued that as a whole the Master's resurrections are concerned with his revival from the suicide which he committed when he digressed from the official ideology in his creative work. The Master refuses to subject this work to the ideological guidance which is based on the teachings of the Anti-Christ or the man-god. Inevitably the death of the artist ensues from this refusal. Once resurrected the Master is not imbued with increased vigour for creative activity. On the contrary, he is simply yearning for peace which he finally attains through the agency of the devil. The Master's case shows that the optimism voiced by Sergei Bulgakov in Vekhi was misconceived since the metaphysical truth which the Master had sought to contain in his story is rejected by the Moscow literary establishment. In two decades which separate the writings of Sergei and Mikhail Bulgakov the intellectual leaders of the Russian society had evidently progressed even further in the direction indicated to them by the Anti-Christ.

5. Split personality

While both Berdyaev and Sergei Bulgakov depict the Russian intelligentsia as lacking in genuine spirituality, M. Gershenzon¹⁹ likens its members - and the Russian people in general - to cripples suffering from a deep split which has occurred between their original selves ("я") and their consciousness. Gershenzon arrives at this diagnosis by reasoning as follows:

Мы калеки потому, что наша личность раздвоена, что мы утратили способность естественного развития, где создание растёт заодно с волею, что наше сознание, как паровоз, оторвавшийся от поезда, умчалось далеко и мчится впустую, оставив втуне нашу чувственно-волевою жизнь. Русский интеллигент ... человек, ... живущий *вне себя*, в буквальном смысле слова, т.е. признающий единственно-достойным объектом своего интереса и участия нечто лежащее вне его личности - народ, общество, государство. (70)

It is interesting to note that Sergei Bulgakov sees the Russians living 'outside religion' and Gershenzon 'outside themselves'. Both thinkers are, in fact, discussing the very same condition affecting the Russian nation: apathy towards philosophical or metaphysical truth.

Consciousness (сознание) is highly important in Gershenzon's view because it is the spiritual organ through which truth becomes attainable to man. He claims that the way in which man's consciousness operates determines both the psychological and physical order of his personality and, furthermore, that the operation of man's consciousness, in terms of direction and capacity, is to a considerable extent autonomous. In other words, man cannot control his conscious life entirely by his will, since consciousness also exists or operates independently from his will. Gershenzon considers this independence of consciousness vital to man's spiritual being, as thus

Сознание может уходить от личности вдаль, блуждать свободно по разным путям, долетать до неба. (72)

In this context Gershenzon speaks of man reaching towards God's truth which he explains simply as norm (норма) underlying all human existence. This truth affects mankind through the life experience attained in the Christian era and it is, in Gershenzon's words,

[Эта истина] ... идеал только для каждого отдельного сознания, по существу же она - не должное, а только высшее обобщение всечеловеческого опыта, т.е. истинно-сущее, единственно-реальное, именно та норма, которая соответствует подлинному и вечному существу человека. (73)

Gershenzon's understanding of the divine truth attainable through independent consciousness in the spiritual realms of human existence parallels closely C. G. Jung's doctrine relating to the rich potential lodged in the depths of the mind's unconscious region²⁰.

Jung's doctrine will be referred to later in this thesis to illustrate the devil's role in Master i Margarita. However, it seems appropriate that Gershenzon's and Jung's parallel understanding of one of the fundamental issues included in the thematic tissue of Master i Margarita should be acknowledged here: that is, their conception of the manifestation of God's image in man.

Gershenzon finds the origins of the manifestation of God's image in man in divine truth to which some attention has been given above. He explains further that

... она [Божественная истина] рождается из самых основ человеческого духа, - она с неотразимой силой внедряется в каждое отдельное сознание, так что, раз представ уму, она уже овладевает им, от нее некуда бежать, ибо она - Бог в человеке, то-есть сознательное космическое самоопределение человека. (73)

Jung, on the one hand, explains the God-image from the psychological point of view as 'a symbol of the self', a symbol 'of psychic wholeness'; on the other hand, he says that the God-image can be explained 'as a reflection of the self, or, conversely ... the self as an *imago Dei* in man'²¹. The background knowledge of Gershenzon's and Jung's understanding of the divine aspect of man's being will help to explain the phenomenon of split personality through which Mikhail Bulgakov depicts man's spiritual poverty in his novel.

After having dealt with the positive aspects of consciousness, that is, aspects relating to the acquisition of divine truth, Gershenzon admits that although it bestows the greatest blessing upon mankind a great deal of potential danger is also present in consciousness. Gershenzon states that to know the truth and to live according to it are two different propositions. Consciousness itself, according to him, has no connection with the world of material reality. Such connection may be established only through

the operation of man's will; only thus may the acquired truth be realised in the immediate sphere of being. The danger lodged in consciousness lies in particular in its autonomous nature: this autonomy threatens man constantly with a possible split between logical consciousness (логическое сознание) and sentient personality (чувственная личность). If individual consciousness is severed from personality serious consequences ensue:

... во-первых, сознание перестает руководить волею, бросает ее ... на произвол ее страстей, во-вторых, само оно, не контролируемое ... той непогрешимой целесообразностью, средоточием которой является в нас воля, начинает блуждать вкряк и вкося, теряет перспективу, ударяется в односторонности, впадает в величайшие ошибки.
(73-74)

On the other hand, acknowledging the difficulty of the task, Gershenzon attempts to define a normally active consciousness of a healthy, whole human being:

Это в высшем смысле слова эгоцентризм сознания, сам по себе бессознательный, - какое-то неопишное взаимодействие сознания и чувственной личности, их непрерывная борьба и минутное уравнивание, в глубине-гармонический рост всего человека, снаружи, может быть, ряд потрясений.
(74)

Such unity as described above by Gershenzon becomes identifiable with the universal unity of being, i.e. the discovery of 'I' leads to the revelation of universal ideas. Gershenzon argues that the perception of such unity necessarily leads to man becoming religious: religiousness is part of the spiritual wholeness which man attains as a result of his discovery of the universal ideas.

In Master i Margarita Bulgakov shows how Moscow society is undermined by its citizens' failure to perceive such a unity as Gershenzon attempts to define above. The phenomenon of split personality occurs repeatedly in Bulgakov's novel in the context of a division between the characters' private and public selves - and

their private and public lives - between the material and spiritual aspects of being and between the demands arising from the recognition of philosophical truth and the compulsory adherence to

'socialist unreality'. Bulgakov presents the phenomenon of split personality in his work by means of showing how the main characters live 'outside themselves' in the literal sense of this expression.

Gershenzon argued previously that 'Русский интеллигент ...

человек, ... живущий *вне себя*, в буквальном смысле слова' (70).

Gershenzon meant that a certain section of the Russian intelligentsia directed its interest wholly towards issues outwith their own personal existence, i.e. towards people, society and state. With creative ingenuity Bulgakov extends Gershenzon's argument in such a manner that the novel's characters come to live outside themselves in the fictional manifestations which represent those areas of their wholeness of being in which they are crippled. For example: Berlioz believes in reason; the devil is conjured up as a factual manifestation of the irrational. That is, Berlioz lives in the devil since the irrational aspect of being which the editor has sought to suppress is manifest in Woland. An attempt will be made later in this thesis to show that, similarly, Bezdomny comes to live in the Master: the Master emerges as the true artist in comparison with the false, official artist from Bezdomny's condition of schizophrenia. Margarita becomes a witch: her spirit is liberated from her body and it flies to meet the Master whose memory she has tried to suppress. These examples abound in Bulgakov's novel. It is possible to claim that Master i Margarita has been constructed in such a way that as a whole it reflects the kind of unity of personality, of universal being to which Gershenzon refers in his essay. The novel embraces a multiplicity of split personalities - whom Gershenzon would call cripples -

and only a true artist, like Bulgakov, can perceive an outline of all humanity in such a gallery of shattered images.

6. Attitude to ordinary people

Both the contributors to Vekhi and Mikhail Bulgakov depict the intellectual leaders of their society as adopting a patronising attitude to ordinary people: they are shown as lacking in regard for the people. Gershenzon explains that the intelligentsia's crippled condition is responsible for its inability to understand the kind of wholeness of being which the mentality of the ordinary Russian people (народ) is capable of embracing²². Gershenzon writes:

Сами бездушные, мы не могли понять, что душа народа -
вовсе не *tabula rasa*, на которой без труда можно чертить
письмена высшей образованности. (85)

He recalls the way in which the Slavophiles had tried to heighten the intelligentsia's estimation of ordinary people: the people may be compared to children as far as learning is concerned, but they must be likened to elders on the basis of their experience of life and their view of the world which has evolved from it.

According to Gershenzon, the people hold beliefs which are primarily religious and which provide them with the means of coming to terms with life in general. The intelligentsia dismissed such beliefs as wild and primitive. Bulgakov's fictional depiction of the ordinary Moscow citizens in the 1930's shows that the intelligentsia's patronising attempts to enlighten the people in their darkness through ideological indoctrination have been unsuccessful.

In Master i Margarita the devil bears witness to the fact that despite constant and severe indoctrination the official ideology has failed to effect any meaningful change in the ordinary people of

Moscow. Woland remarks that inwardly people have remained the same as they always were: both 'thoughtless' and 'compassionate'. There are numerous examples in Bulgakov's novel which demonstrate that the ancient peasant superstitions are still rampant amidst the rational outlook on life fostered by official ideology and, furthermore, that these beliefs have simply adapted to accommodate the mystery surrounding the Soviet authorities' political tactics in pursuing witch-hunts etc. in Moscow in the 1930's. In addition to superstition, religious habits are still common amongst the citizens; even Ivan Bezdomny grabs hold of an icon as he pursues the devil. Thus old beliefs and habits have survived in the face of the prevailing rational, materialist ideology and they continue to aid the people to come to terms with life and its mysteries.

In his essay Gershenzon pleads for the intelligentsia to strive for a more complete understanding of their own wholeness and also of the nature of the ordinary Russian people. He concludes by stating that a movement towards this end had already begun amongst the intelligentsia:

Движение, о котором я говорю, - к творческому личному самосознанию, - уже началось ... (96)

Gershenzon's plea is fully in accordance with C. G. Jung's ideas relating to modern man's need for self-knowledge²³ which in Jung's terms means the attainment of the utmost possible knowledge of one's wholeness. In the context of Master i Margarita it is important to note that in Jung's opinion the attainment of such knowledge is the most important way of finding an answer to the problem of evil in modern society. Later in this thesis it will be illustrated that Bulgakov's novel can be seen as representing a process in the course of which wholeness of being begins to emerge as the suppressed

regions of humanity are revived through the devil's agency. The characters are confronted with knowledge of their hidden aspects whose recovery aids the revelation of the truth about evil as it affected Soviet society in the 1930's.

In his optimistic final note Gershenzon anticipates that the attainment of self-knowledge enables the individual to participate in public and social concerns in a more meaningful manner. Sadly, the attainment of this knowledge in the context of Bulgakov's work leads to the characters becoming alienated from their society, which considers such knowledge as a symptom of mental illness and madness, a threat to the status quo which it seeks to maintain at any cost.

7. Good and evil

Bulgakov's preoccupation with evil in Master i Margarita is related to the ethics of nihilism as discussed in S. Frank's Vekhi essay²⁴ in the sense that the novel's conformist characters determine questions of right and wrong according to a uni-dimensional code of morality.

In Bulgakov's novel the senior editor's instruction of the unsophisticated young man shows that the prevailing materialist and rationalist dogma defines clearly the ethical code of behaviour in Moscow. Evil and wrong consist of everything that fails to enhance the authority of the official ideology while good and right embrace all that serves to maintain the status quo and to strengthen the grip of the accepted dogma on the citizens. The uni-dimensional quality of this outlook can be traced to the guiding principle of the nihilist ethics which centres on the assumption that material reality is the only reality. Frank states that one of the most regrettable consequences of such an assumption is reflected in the inept, even

hostile, attitude which the radical intelligentsia adopted to culture; in the Russian context culture came to be identified with utilitarianism²⁵. In Master i Margarita Berlioz' uncompromising dismissal of the whole history of divinity (as it is expressed through stories relating to gods) as mythical nonsense shows that Frank's statement applies also to the Russian intellectuals of the 1930's.

In his novel Bulgakov juxtaposes the official dogma with the natural qualities of man in order to demonstrate that humanity cannot be contained within the limits of narrow dogmatism. The discrepancy which exists between ideology and real life is revealed as the devil arrives in the city. In his essay Frank explains that the discrepancy between theory and people arose from the fact that the intelligentsia's socialist 'belief' was based on so-called 'utilitarian altruism'²⁶. Frank hastens to add, however, that a socialist is not an altruist; it is true that he seeks to increase human happiness, but he does not love the living people, he loves his idea, i.e. the single idea of human happiness. As a result of the alienation which necessarily ensues from this attitude to living people and real life, morality which is derived from the nihilist 'belief' is moralistic, even monastic, in nature. In other words, good and evil are clearly discernible by the followers of this 'belief'; there is no room for hesitation or doubt.

In Master i Margarita the devil's arrival in Moscow undermines severely the illusory security which the adoption of a dogmatic outlook on life has apparently created in the city. In terms of the official ethics Woland is evil because he represents those regions of humanity whose existence the prevailing ideology seeks to ignore and even to deny: for example, the official dogma propounds that material

reality is the only reality and Woland represents the reality of a metaphysical dimension. With the devil's appearance the characters are compelled to face evil as it concerns them both individually and socially - not in terms of the official code of ethics, but as it is determined according to a more profound understanding of morality.

8. Conclusion

It is argued in this thesis that the conditions which the contributors to Vekhi anticipate in their essays have become reality in Moscow in the 1930's as depicted by Bulgakov in Master i Margarita. That is, at the ideological leaders' direction the intellectual environment has been turned into a spiritual desert. In order to give expression to the deep anxiety which characterised Bulgakov's attitude to the dogmatic outlook on life adopted by his society Bulgakov acts as the devil's disciple in his novel: he writes about evil from the devil's point of view. With the dissolution of the mystery surrounding the truth about evil in Moscow good begins to emerge.

Bulgakov's treatment of the Master's predicament in the novel reveals that he was acutely aware of the fact that Master i Margarita could never be brought out into the open. The fate of the Master's story would await any attempt to have the novel published. The evil of narrow dogmatism which is typical of Soviet society's official ideology is amply illustrated through Bulgakov's unravelling of the theme of writer versus society. In a more general sense, the truth about evil as revealed through the devil's agency in the novel shows that, instead of leading the nation towards enlightenment, utilitarianism, atheism and socialism, the ideological leaders of the new society plunge it into the depths of superstition and corrupt

materialism.

The aim of this chapter, which has sought to explain how certain - not all - key ideas expressed in Vekhi are reflected in Master i Margarita, has been to provide some illumination of the novel's philosophical and intellectual background. In this context it can be argued that the issues of loss of spirituality, utilitarian 'faith', split personality and want of innate, instinctive understanding of good and evil, of right and wrong, as discussed in the essays of Vekhi, reappear more than two decades later as the primary themes of Mikhail Bulgakov's novel where Satan is loosed upon the city of Moscow.

CHAPTER TWO:
Woland's genealogy

1. Introduction

In Master i Margarita¹ the devil acts as an agent through whom the image of a whole human being emerges from the novel. In the previous chapter on Vekhi² it was indicated that the division of this wholeness could be traced back to the time when radicalism which ignored the metaphysical aspects of human existence began to dominate life in Russian society. Before turning to a more detailed exploration of the devil's role in Bulgakov's novel it seems appropriate that some reference should be made to the genealogy of the devil in the light of two works which Bulgakov himself is known to have used frequently while working on Master i Margarita³. They are M. A. Orlov's study entitled Istoriya snosheniy cheloveka s d'yavolom⁴ and the Russian Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia⁵ - more specifically, the entries in it on which Bulgakov made innumerable notes when writing the novel. This sketch of the devil's genealogy aims to provide some information on Bulgakov's characterisation of Woland as a devil who is not evil but who wills evil in order to do good.

2. Arrogance

Evil has preoccupied man through the ages. According to the Bible myth, evil ensues from the cataclysmic event of the Fall and permeates the consequential state of Original Sin. M. A. Orlov's study, Istoriya snosheniy cheloveka s d'yavolom⁶, focuses on the heathen aspect of man's preoccupation with evil, i.e. how evil is manifest in the realm of folk beliefs and customs. In his introduction Orlov describes the original state when man was still devoid of the arrogance which later came to define his attitude to nature. At that time man saw himself as the weaker being and animals were true gods to him. He acknowledged their strength and might, he trembled

and prayed to them. Then man was surrounded by something mysterious and strange which imprisoned his imperfect mind or understanding in such a way that he lived in a kind of permanent hallucinatory state. Reason and common sense were dominated by emotion and man felt himself incapable of drawing any rational conclusions about his natural surroundings. His interpretation of nature's ways became increasingly more fantastic.

In their studies of the origins of man's understanding of good and evil Orlov describes the original state as a time when man lived unaffected by the pride of his own importance. In Master i Margarita the circumstances which according to Orlov define man's existence at the early stage have undergone a complete revolution. Modern man's arrogance is most clearly illustrated in the character of the literary editor Berlioz whose purely rational approach to life has endowed him with the illusion that man is the master of his life and of his environment. In Bulgakov's novel Berlioz finds all the explanations relevant to his existence in the rational outlook on life which he has fully adopted. According to this outlook life ends at death and material reality is the only reality. Questions relating to metaphysical phenomena are readily rejected by Berlioz as they cannot be answered on the basis of reason.

Orlov writes that at the primary stage man imagined all things and phenomena pertaining to the universe as living beings endowed with a will and passions. Man respected and paid greater attention to those beings with whom he had to deal most frequently and who asserted their will and passions most forcibly upon his destiny. Subsequently, these original beliefs attained a more general meaning and the objects and phenomena relating to the external world came to be shrouded in divinity. This change in man's relationship with nature heralded the

rise of religions which eventually came to provide answers to the question of death. Almost invariably religions acquired the concept of dualism, i.e. most religions came to distinguish good divinities from evil ones, gods from demons. Soviet society's progress towards godlessness - in a metaphysical sense - at the time which Bulgakov describes in his novel emerges with inevitable certainty against the background of Orlov's exposition of the early stages in the development of the ideas of divinity: the fearful humility which defined man's attitude to the unknown at the primary stage has been replaced by irreverent pride culminating in the idea of man-godhood by which Soviet society is blinded. The dictates of the official dogma direct the citizens, not to stand in awe, but to assume control of 'all things and phenomena pertaining to the universe'. The duality of the official dogma is manifest in the juxtaposition of the man-god with the devil (e.g. Berlioz versus Woland).

3. Man willing evil

The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia explains under its entry of 'D'yavol (- klevetnik, obol'stitel')⁷ that the church's teaching about the evil spirit is alien to the concept of dualism in the sense that it acknowledges the Creator as the originator of both good and evil spirits: at the beginning the evil spirit was a good angel who rebelled willfully against God and thus became a being of evil and darkness. Furthermore, the Encyclopedia asserts that the church's teaching has always maintained that the devil cannot compel man to evil without man himself willing it. Pride, arrogance, envy and greed are cited as the primary causes for God's dismissal of the rebellious spirits.

In Bulgakov's novel there is little evidence of Woland's

rebellion against God. On the contrary, repeated references are made to the fact that the devil is furthering the purposes of the Kingdom of Light: in Mephistopheles' words, Woland wills evil and does good. However, Bulgakov's presentation of the devil agrees with the church's view of the evil spirit in the sense that Woland must be seen as part of the idea of God: it will be shown later that Woland is a reflection of the double-sidedness of the God-image as conceived by C. G. Jung⁸. The most revealing parallel between Bulgakov's characterisation of the devil and the church's view of him is found in the belief that the devil cannot compel man to evil without man himself willing it. Bulgakov presents the devil as a catalyst who brings forth evil (e.g. pride, arrogance, envy, greed) inherent in the characters of the novel.

4. The devil's likeness

The Encyclopedia's exposition of the devil from the ethnological point of view⁹ draws attention to the fact that, as a general rule, man is not satisfied simply with understanding an abstract power or force but will always seek to contain the intangible idea in a concrete, realistic image of something that is familiar to him. In a sense this aspiration marks a point at which the development outlined in Orlov's introduction - 'the objects and phenomena relating to the external world came to be shrouded in divinity'¹⁰ - suffers a reversal. The search for realistic images comprises also a search for the tangible representation of the evil spirit.

The devil has also been portrayed in the likeness of representatives of lesser known tribes and nations simply because these people were different. In old Russia he was commonly seen as a Pole or a German. During the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries images of the devil

became increasingly more complex, but already at the end of the 17th century their excellence began to be undermined by the art of satire and caricature.

In Bulgakov's novel the devil and the members of his retinue appear in human and animal disguises. Woland, Koroviev, Azazello and Hella look more or less like human beings; Behemoth acts like a human being but looks like a large black cat. The first manifestation of the devilish spirit in the novel takes the form of a vision. Bulgakov contains an 'intangible idea in a concrete, realistic image'¹¹ as follows:

И тут знойный воздух сгустился перед ним, и соткался из этого воздуха прозрачный гражданин престранного вида. На маленькой головке жокейский картузик, клетчатый кургузый воздушный же пиджачок ... Гражданин ростом в сажень, но в плечах узок, худ неимоверно, и физиономия, прошу заметить, глумливая. (424)

Koroviev's form assumes a human likeness which is at first transparent. The shimmering heat of the afternoon accounts partly for the insubstantiality of the apparition. On the other hand, the transparency implies that Koroviev is a spirit originating from hellish heat which characterises the environment of the novel's Moscow chapters.

Woland's outward appearance is extraordinary in the sense that it seems to vary according to each observer. The data relating to the description of Woland is collated after he has left Moscow. The diversity of the acquired information is astonishing:

Так, в первой из них сказано, что человек этот был маленького роста, зубы имел золотые и хромал на правую ногу. Во второй - что человек был росту громадного, коронки имел платиновые, хромал на левую ногу. Третья лаконически сообщает, что особых примет у человека не было.

Приходится признать, что ни одна из этих сводок никуда не годится. (426)

The lack of unanimity as to the information relating to the devil's outward appearance suggests that every informer or individual creates his or her image of the devil and that the devil's appearance is changeable. In the text of Genesis God announces: 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ...'¹². As God created man in his own image, so Bulgakov's characters - indoctrinated to believe in man-godhood - evoke and depict a devil who corresponds to their individual view of him while each view comes to reflect the individual characters themselves.

Above the characters' descriptions of the devil towers the narrator's image of him:

Раньше всего: ни на какую ногу описываемый не хромал, и росту был не маленького и не громадного, а просто высокого. Что касается зубов, то с левой стороны у него были платиновые коронки, а с правой - золотые. (426)

Bulgakov's description of Woland accords well with the convention of presenting the devil as a foreigner:

Он был в дорогом сером костюме, в заграничных, в цвет костюма, туфлях. Серый берет он лихо заломил на ухо, под мышкой нес трость с черным набалдашником в виде головы пуделя. По виду - лет сорока с лишним. Рот какой-то кривой. Выбрит гладко. Брюнет. Правый глаз черный, левый почему-то зеленый. Брови черные, но одна выше другой. Словом - иностранец. (426-7)

Thus Woland emerges as a well-dressed foreigner whose facial characteristics are irregular, asymmetrical. Berlioz and Bezdomny detect quickly the fact that Woland must be a foreigner as his outward appearance is so different from that of the Moscow citizens. They become alarmed as the very difference itself threatens the uniformity upon which their enclosed society's stability and survival rest. Consequently, a foreigner can easily be turned into a devil in a society which holds the view that any exception to the rule of the official dogma must be evil.

The mention of precious metals, i.e. platinum and gold, and the reference to black and green colours recalls characteristics commonly attributed to the devil's appearance in folk tradition. The outline of the black poodle will emerge only later as the insignia of the devil's reign. At this stage it simply implies the devil's connection with symbols and signs in which animals are figured. Although Woland himself is not likened to animal forms in Bulgakov's novel a number of different animals are conjured up through the magic which his assistants wield, e.g. the hog on which Natasha rides, the bird on the doctor's table, the rook which acts as Margarita's driver. Woland appears only in two disguises throughout the novel: as a stylish foreigner and magician in the material reality of Moscow and as a shabby, untidy devil suffering from rheumatism on his own 'fifth dimension'. The satire which emerges from Bulgakov's portrayal of the devil does not in any way diminish Woland's stature as it relates wholly to the revelation of the folly and corruption with which Moscow society had become riddled.

5. The devil's influence

It is made quite clear by Bulgakov in Master i Margarita that the devil is neither omniscient, nor omnipotent as regards his influence on human beings. For example, he does not take the final decision on the Master's destiny; neither does he know what this decision is until it is reported to him by an emissary from the Kingdom of Light. After that he helps to execute this decision's command. Woland does, however, exercise considerable influence on human beings as illustrated by the state of general disorder in Moscow while he visits the city. This influence can be understood better in the light of the essay which appears in the Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia under the entry of

'Demon'¹³.

In this essay V. Solov'ev provides a further dimension to the study of Woland's genealogy as he explains how the demonic spirit is manifest in classical literature, religion and philosophy. Solov'ev refers to Homer's epos and he points out that in Homer's writing - unlike in Master i Margarita - it is the demon who takes the final decision on human destinies. Here the demon is remembered in oaths, he is seen as the good and wise inspiration from above and, furthermore, the power to arouse unusual courage and decisiveness in human beings is ascribed to the demon¹⁴. In Moscow depicted by Bulgakov the devil is constantly remembered in oaths. Only these oaths are not uttered for the solemn evocation of the demon in order that some assistance would be acquired from the 'other world', but they are voiced by the characters quite involuntarily and, as it turns out, also unwittingly. There are numerous instances in the novel where ordinary everyday expressions are taken by Bulgakov in their literal meaning and employed as a means of making metaphysical ideas manifest in the material reality of Moscow. Oaths connected with the evocation of the devil are most common amongst these instances.

According to Solov'ev gods and demons were seen as an integral part of man's everyday existence in the classical world. Similarly, in Master i Margarita the devil plays an essential part in the Moscow citizens' daily lives. The frequency with which he is summoned by the characters bears evidence to this. It is important to note that the devil or his assistants appear almost without exception only when called forth by the citizens. The following examples show what kind of expressions are used when referring to the devil:

Koroviev's first appearance in the novel is preceded by

Berlioz thinking:

" ... пора бросить все к черту ..." (424)

After the transparent vision of Koroviev disappears the editor dismisses the whole incident by swearing:

- Фу ты черт! (425)

In connection with the conversation between Woland, Berlioz and Bezdomny the following expressions are employed:

"Черт, слышал все ..." (Berlioz) (434)

... черт знает ... (the narrator) (460)

The Chairman of the Theatrical Commission, Prokhor Petrovich, is spirited out of his suit as a result of saying

" ... черти б меня взяли!" (606)

Margarita's first meeting with Azazello follows her impulsive, desperate utterance:

"Ах, право, дьяволу бы я заложила душу, чтобы только узнать, жив он или нет!" (639)

With these words Margarita makes a bargain with the devil:

she offers her soul in exchange for knowledge of the Master.

In the novel there are countless examples of the unsuspecting characters unwittingly calling for the devil.

In most cases the characters use the 'devilish' expressions to dismiss matters unpalatable to them. The evocation of the devil in this manner introduces a great deal of grotesque humour into the novel as the reader has superior knowledge of the fact that 'the devil does know' and 'the devil does take'. Thus the reader shares the author's derisory laughter at man's ignorance as regards the devil's existence. It must be emphasised at this point that expressions or oaths relating to the devil are extremely common in Russian everyday language and almost innocuous in meaning. This factor greatly increases the humour and the irony which arises from the use of these expressions:

by repeatedly calling to the devil the Moscow citizens speak and accept the truth of his reality or existence despite themselves. In this context the deepest irony emerges from the fact that Soviet citizens who are allegedly professed atheists and materialists keep referring to a metaphysical power time after time. Thus, far from succeeding in erasing all traces of spirituality from man's awareness the materialist dogma has not succeeded even in eradicating its superficial manifestation from everyday speech. The ordinary people's willingness to blame the devil and witchcraft for happenings which cannot be explained otherwise - often for reasons of self-preservation - bears further witness to the fact that the devil's influence must be taken into account as an integral part of everyday life in Moscow in the 1930's as presented in Master i Margarita.

The question now arises as to what kind of influence the devil exercises on human beings. In his essay Solov'ev states that in Homer's work the demon may have either a positive or a negative effect on man's destiny. It has already been mentioned that Homer sees the demon as a good and wise inspiration on men and also as an instigator of courage and decisiveness in them. In the Master's and Margarita's case the devil acts as an agent who is connected with inspiration and unusual courage and decisiveness. In a later chapter the devil's dimension will be discussed in detail and an attempt will be made to show that Margarita acts as inspiration both to the Master's creative activity and to his resurrection from the asylum. In order to accomplish, particularly, the latter mission unusual qualities are required of her. Since Margarita emerges from the novel as the character who is most at ease on the devil's dimension it is possible to argue that the inspiration, the unusual courage and decisiveness

with which Bulgakov endows her in the novel are at least partly derived from her apparently natural affinity with the devil. Only it must be emphasised in this context that the inspiration which Margarita can offer to the Master's art is not so much good or wise as simply life-enhancing: she puts her life into the Master's story.

Solov'ev points out that more frequently, however, the demon is considered by Homer as a being who exercises a harmful power over man: a raging fire connected with the killing of soldiers, a violent death, an unfavourable wind, a deceptive and destructive instigation to evil deeds and the ability to endow a person with a destructive power are all attributed to the demon. In Homer's work also the Olympian gods are endowed with evil qualities and they are shown to exercise a destructive influence on man. At first sight it would appear that in Bulgakov's novel the effect which the devil and his retinue have on the citizens and life in Moscow parallels closely the above description of the demons' destructive influence on human beings in the world of Antiquity. Woland and his assistants are shown to wield a harmful influence on the Moscow citizens in the sense that during their stay in the city life becomes extremely disorderly there and the people suffer from a great deal of confusion and even terror. However, as it will be argued later in this thesis, neither the devil nor his assistants display either good or evil qualities in the novel. Admittedly they play pranks, deceive and pretend but all this is done in order that evil may be willed out of the citizens themselves and as a result good will ensue.

It is true to say that the protagonists of Bulgakov's novel who are in direct contact with the devil either end up in the mental asylum or die, or both. This happens, for instance, to the Master, Margarita, Berlioz, Bezdomny, the compère Bengalsky etc. Arrests

take place and trials or investigations ensue as a result of the tricks played upon the Moscow citizens by Woland's assistants. On the whole the destinies of those characters with whom Woland has dealings turn out to be unfortunate. Their lives deteriorate either because they make an attempt to swim against the tide of the official ideology (i.e. the Master) or because they are involved in telling lies and in petty corruption for personal gain (e.g. Bosoi).

On the other hand, according to the classical understanding of demons the existence of evil demons was related to the individual's earthly life¹⁵. If the individual was destined to become a demon after his death, then the choice of whether he would become a good or evil demon depended on the nature of his earthly life: a wicked life would naturally give birth to an evil demon. When related to Bulgakov's novel this aspect of the classical view of demons acquires a deep layer of irony: in terms of Soviet society a happy man has been endowed with a demon of self-deception and falsity and an unfortunate man with a demon who commits his master to seek the truth. This proposition implies that man has little control over his destiny and, furthermore, that happiness in Soviet society is based on self-deception and falsity (good) and misfortune on the recognition of the truth (evil). Bulgakov's task in Master i Margarita embraces the difficulty of presenting the opposition of good and evil which is wholly out of balance with the conventional understanding of morality: in the novel happiness ensues from good which in conventional terms would be seen as evil and misfortune is born out of evil which in conventional terms would be defined as good. Herein lies the paradox outlined by the contributors to Vekhi and explored by Mikhail Bulgakov in his fiction.

It seems relevant that in connection with the discussion on the devil's influence some attention should be given also to outlining the region or regions from where he originates and where he operates. It is quite clear in Master i Margarita that Woland's dimension is related both to the world of material reality and the Kingdom of Light. For example, he acts as an intermediary between these two levels at the end of the novel where he helps to execute the command by which the Master's and Margarita's destiny is decided upon. In the classical culture, too, the demon may be seen as an intermediary between the immortal divinity and the mortal man¹⁶. This conception arises from an understanding according to which demons are the dead people of the golden era. When these people were enveloped in the earth's bosom, Zeus endowed them with glory and made them guardians of the rest of the dead people. Satan's Ball establishes Woland's connection with the world of the dead: the guests emerge from their graves through the fire to attend the rout which is hosted by the devil. In addition to this, Woland must be seen also as an intermediary between temporality and eternity, between life and death in the sense that through his agency the Master's novel survives in a kind of state of 'non-existence' or oblivion. In the Master's and Margarita's case it can be claimed that Woland mediates between the paradoxical states of death in life (the material reality of Moscow) and life in death (the final peace of oblivion attainable in the first circle of hell).

6. In support of the irrational fact

In Master i Margarita the conformist characters believe that they possess the kind of mind or intellect which can control the universe. However, the apparent omnipotence of the man-god - whose

emergence was explored in the previous chapter in the light of ideas put forward by notable thinkers in Vekhi¹⁷ - is seriously undermined by the devil's appearance. Just as in the classical world rational monism failed to account sufficiently for the whole of empirical reality, so the rational outlook upon which Soviet society is founded cannot embrace all questions relating to such reality. For example, Berlioz asserts that there is no evidence for the existence of God in the realm of reason. Woland's visit to Moscow demonstrates amply the inadequacy of the official rationalist and materialist ideology in relation to the empirical reality of human existence. It is shown in the novel that the empirical reality of human existence is not confined simply to the experience of purely material things and events but comprises also the perception of the metaphysical phenomena of being. For this reason a number of classical philosophers spoke out in support of the irrational fact in opposition to absolute reason, i.e. 'права иррационального факта против абсолютного разума'¹⁸.

For example, Socrates mocked at deficient rational cosmology while, on the other hand, he himself came to be criticised for bringing into existence new demons. That is, Socrates accepted that the world and all human existence are managed by one superior intellect or mind which acts according to expediency; he identified virtue with recognition of the truth and believed that the ways and means through which the all-pervading intellect manifests itself are to a large extent purely empirical and irrational (i.e. in the sense that their reason is not accessible to man). This relates to Socrates' favourable testimony relating to the moments of demonic inspiration he himself experienced. Thus while reducing the essence of morals to notions conceived by reason Socrates, on the basis of his own experience, envisaged a mystical element which he understood as

dominating rational motives in particular manifestations of man's ethical life.

While it can be argued that the whole of Bulgakov's novel bears witness to the triumph of the mystical element over reason in man's ethical life it must be recognised that, like Socrates, Bulgakov does not seek to dismiss reason as such, but he tries to show the limitations of the kind of outlook which is based exclusively on reason. For this purpose Bulgakov acknowledges the reality of the irrational fact, which becomes manifest in the character of Woland, and he sets this fact in opposition to absolute reason on which the official outlook depends. Such opposition illustrates that from the official viewpoint Woland represents evil. His very existence threatens the accepted good propounded by the official ideology. However, as regards the truth concerning the totality of human experience Woland must be seen as wielding a positive and good influence: through his agency this truth is illuminated time and time again. The paradoxical duality which characterises Woland's relation to the absolute opposites of good and evil is even further developed by Bulgakov in his novel. This development leads to the emergency of what C. G. Jung calls the '*complexio oppositorum*' of the God-image in man¹⁹ and it is explained below in the context of the development which occurred in classical culture as regards demons.

According to Solov'ev in the post-Socratic epoch some writers still accepted the simple opposition of good and evil demons. This opposition was sometimes expressed in a tendency to call the evil ones demons and the good ones gods. However, a clear distinction into good and evil could not be maintained any longer in relation to classical mythological divinities as there was not a single being

amongst them who was devoid of evil traits or deeds. When the religious-philosophical ideas came to include the notion of the worthiness of worshipping only the absolute good, the entire Hellenistic pantheon had to be expelled from the sphere of true divinity; that is, all Olympian gods and goddesses turned out to be demons, spirits of deception and evil. Thus this development, which was finally sanctioned by patristic philosophy, was not in any way accidental or external to Hellenistic thought but, in fact, contained the last expression of the classical view on the subject of demons²⁰.

Soviet society's official ideology is also shown in Bulgakov's novel to advocate worshipping only the absolute good which is clearly defined in terms of reason. As Bulgakov rejects the exclusive use of reason he inevitably moves away from a morality dictated by its command. Subsequently, a new understanding of the moral absolutes of good and evil is conceived in the novel; it is best described by C. G. Jung's terms which refer to a conflict where the dark aspects of the God-image (evil) come into opposition with the view that God is Light (good)²¹. It will be argued later in this thesis that this is the form in which Bulgakov perceives the God-image entering man. Vekhi's contributors lament the radical intelligentsia's lack of understanding of the complexity of human experience, particularly in its metaphysical manifestations. In Master i Margarita the conformist characters become so inextricably caught in the web of this complexity - admittedly only while the devil is in the city - that they can no longer escape its reality. In the following chapter an attempt will be made to show that the paradoxical way in which Bulgakov sees the God-image entering man is based on a far deeper and more realistic awareness of the kind of wholeness of human life and unity of vision (advocated particularly by Gershenzon in Vekhi)²²



than could be contained in any view asserting the virtue of a specific absolutist principle.

CHAPTER THREE:

The devil in Moscow

1. Introduction

The role of the devil and his assistants in Master i Margarita¹ is now studied from two different standpoints. The first half of this chapter concentrates on looking at the devil in relation to Berlioz and Bezdomny, that is, as he appears 'in support of the irrational fact' which is placed in opposition to absolute reason². In the second half of the chapter the devil and his assistants are viewed in relation to ordinary Moscow people. Here, Woland and his retinue are seen to stand for a more common-sense, more rational attitude to life than that to which the superstitious citizens adhere. In both sections the Moscow characters are shown to lead a false life in the sense that they try to ignore man's essential nature as it exists both in its material and metaphysical manifestations. Vekhi's essayists³ were only too aware of the consequences which would ensue from adherence to ideologies which endeavour to suppress man's spirituality. They also understood the potential spiritual strength inherent in the Russian people which the radical intelligentsia so lightly dismissed in its fervour for seeking to enlighten, or indoctrinate, the masses⁴. In this chapter an attempt will be made to show that in Master i Margarita Bulgakov depicts the false and illusory atmosphere which prevails in Moscow as resulting from the people's acceptance - both enforced and voluntary - of the highly erroneous picture of man outlined in the dogma to which the radical intelligentsia had given birth and on which the new Soviet society is founded.

In the Grand Inquisitor legend⁵ Dostoevsky deals with the kind of illusory happiness which fails to take into account the true worth of humanity. In Master i Margarita Bulgakov seeks to reveal the truth about evil on which the illusory well-being and stability of

Moscow society depends. Bulgakov's voyage of discovery yields knowledge of the paradox which defines the understanding of good and evil in Moscow as presented in Bulgakov's work and which explains the devil's keenness to prove God's existence.

2. The devil and the unconscious

2.1 Introduction

In connection with a more detailed study of the devil's part in Bulgakov's novel it is helpful to recall Ivan Karamazov's devil as depicted by Dostoevsky⁶. Woland and Ivan's devil have a great deal in common. Although Woland is elegantly and expensively dressed when he enters the novel, in the second part - where he is presented on his own 'fifth dimension' - his appearance evokes memories of the shabbiness of Ivan Karamazov's devil. Patently Koroviev's trousers also have been inherited from Ivan's devil. Both Woland and Ivan's devil suffer from rheumatism. Both of them refer to a particular incident as a likely cause of an illness from which they have come to suffer: Woland puts the blame for his aching knee on his encounter with a beautiful witch in 1571⁷; Ivan's devil recalls how he caught a most unpleasant cold when he was flying through the frosty, empty space in evening dress and an open waistcoat in a hurry to a diplomatic reception⁸. Like Woland and his assistants, Ivan's devil has a habit of disappearing into thin air and, as already mentioned, of flying through space. All these similarities relate to the devils' dress and habits. It is more important, however, for the study of the thematic significance of the devil in Bulgakov's novel to seek the parallels in the way in which Woland and Ivan's devil reflect human psychology.

First it seems appropriate to illustrate how the protagonists' attitude to the devil has changed in the time between the writing of Brat'ya Karamazovy and Master i Margarita⁹. The comparison of Berlioz' and Bezdomny's attitude to the devil with Ivan Karamazov's attitude to him demonstrates the extent to which man's arrogance has increased in this time. Ivan Karamazov questions the devil:

- 1) - Уж и ты в бога не веришь?
- 2) - Есть бог или нет?
- 3) - Не знаешь, а бога видишь? (695)

In Bulgakov's novel the devil poses the questions:

- 1) - ... вы изволили говорить, что Иисуса не было на свете?
- 2) - ... еще и не верите в Бога?
- 3) - Вы - атеисты?! (428)

and finally the devil's most important question:

- 4) - А дьявола тоже нет? (461)

Berlioz and Bezdomny reply in a presumptuous and firm manner. As it is Ivan Karamazov who questions the devil in Dostoevsky's work, it is clear that he is still searching for the answers which Bulgakov's protagonists offer readily and without any hesitation. Ivan Karamazov's manner of questioning is arrogant but the arrogance only truly culminates in the replies given by Berlioz and Bezdomny.

Thus in the opening episode Woland must be seen as the means by which Bulgakov is measuring the extent to which man's arrogance has increased in the society depicted in Master i Margarita. This increase of arrogance was detectable in the intelligentsia's radicalism already at the beginning of this century as illustrated in the previous chapter¹⁰.

2.2 The devil as an aspect of the protagonists' personalities

In both Dostoevsky's and Bulgakov's works the devil may be seen as representing or evoking metaphysical ideas which the protagonists resist on the grounds of reason but which spring from their minds willy-nilly. Ivan Karamazov's devil avoids answering his master's questions and argues simply for his own existence:

- ... Je pense donc je suis, это я знаю наверно, остальное же все, что кругом меня, все эти миры, бог и даже сам сатана, - все это для меня не доказано, существует ли оно само по себе, или есть только одна моя эманация, последовательное развитие моего я, существующего до временно и единолично ... (695)

The devil's words echo the view expressed by Ivan Karamazov a few pages earlier where he claims that the devil is 'a lie', 'an illness' and 'a phantom':

- ... Ты моя галлюцинация. Ты воплощение меня самого, только одной, впрочем, моей стороны ... моих мыслей и чувств, только самых гадких и глупых. (689)

Somewhat later Ivan Karamazov asserts further that the devil is simply an aspect of himself:

- ... ты - я, ты есть я и более ничего! Ты дрянь, ты моя фантазия! (695)

In his novel Bulgakov can be seen as employing Dostoevsky's device in assigning the devil a function through which he (i.e. the devil) becomes an extension or an aspect of the protagonists' personalities. In the course of Master i Margarita Woland and his assistants also come to be regarded as 'a lie', 'an illness' and 'a phantom'. The state of hallucination is offered in the novel as one possible explanation for the magic which this motley group wields. In the early part of the novel Ivan Bezdomny might well have uttered words similar to those with which Ivan Karamazov challenges his devil:

- ... Навяжется же такой кошмар! Но я не боюсь тебя. Я тебя преодолею. Не свезут в сумасшедший дом! (689)

How is the devil employed by Bulgakov to represent certain aspects of the protagonists' personalities and what ideas can be seen manifest in Woland's character? Reference to Ivan Karamazov's devil may serve to illuminate this study.

2.3 Dreams, memory and hallucinations

To illustrate how Bulgakov employs the devil to represent certain aspects of human psychology it is helpful to refer to the explanation which Ivan Karamazov's devil offers to his master in order to demonstrate the importance of the role which he plays in his master's life. Ivan's devil likens his role to the function which dreams perform in human life:

- ... Слушай: в снах, и особенно в кошмарах, ... иногда видит человек такие художественные сны, такую сложную и реальную действительность, такие события или даже целый мир событий, связанный такою интригой с такими неожиданными подробностями, ... что, ... Лев Толстой не сочинит, ... (691-2)

Ivan Karamazov's devil claims that he is like a dream or a nightmare in the sense that he aids man to perceive things which without his agency would remain outside man's awareness:

- ... Я хоть и твоя галлюцинация, но, как и в кошмаре, я говорю вещи оригинальные, какие тебе до сих пор в голову не приходили, ... (692)

Ivan's devil asserts that he does not simply repeat his master's ideas but, on the contrary, gives expression to original thoughts. However, he is caught out by Ivan as he relates an apparently 'original' anecdote. Ivan recalls suddenly:

- ... этот анекдот о квадриллионе лет - это я сам сочинил! ... Я его было забыл ... но он мне припомнился теперь бессознательно - мне самому, а не ты рассказал! (697-8)

The anecdote which has faded from its master's memory has remained in the devil's keeping. Thus, Ivan's devil is closely connected with

the unconscious life of man, i.e. with the uncharted regions of sleep, dreams, nightmares, hallucinations and submerged memories¹¹.

Ivan Karamazov acknowledges the devil's connection with the phenomena which may be seen as issuing from the unconscious springs of man's mind, that is, he calls the devil 'a phantom', 'a hallucination', 'a dream' and 'a nightmare'. The ideas manifest in the devil's character will be discussed later in the thesis but it is worthwhile to note here that the aspects of Ivan's personality represented by the devil are disagreeable and distasteful to him. How does Dostoevsky's presentation of the devil as an issue of man's unconscious life relate to the way in which the devil is depicted in Bulgakov's novel?

To illustrate Woland's relation to man's unconscious life it is necessary to recall the kind of circumstances in which the devil and his assistants appear in the opening chapters of Master i Margarita¹².

The first encounter:

1. Hallucination

A vision of Koroviev arises from hot air and disappears.

Berlioz remarks to Ivan Bezdomny:

- ... Даже что-то вроде галлюцинации было ...
(425)

2. Mythical nonsense

Woland appears as Berlioz is explaining that religions have always had their gods and that the stories relating to these gods are nonsense or myth; the same applies to the story of Jesus Christ. (425-6)

3. Dream

Woland relates the first part of the Pontius Pilate story and at the end of it Bezdomny wonders whether he has been simply dreaming on a park bench. (459)

4. Madness or mental illness

Berlioz and Bezdomny begin to suspect strongly that Woland is mad. They refer to him in their thoughts as 'больной'. Berlioz arrives at an explanation:

"Вот тебе все и объяснилось! - подумал Берлиоз в смятении, - приехал сумасшедший немец или только что спятил на Патриарших. Вот так история!" (460)

In the space of two pages Woland is described as 'безумный', 'при душевной болезни', 'больной' and 'сумасшедший' again. (460-1)

5. Death

Koroviev materialises - no longer a vision, but a tangible being - in order to direct Berlioz' way towards death. This occurs when the editor runs frantically to report to the authorities the appearance of a mad German at the Ponds. (462)

6. Paralysis

After Berlioz' death Bezdomny falls into a state of paralysis which prevents him from catching the criminals, i.e. Woland, Koroviev and the large, black cat. Bezdomny is helpless as

Несколько раз он пытался подняться, но ноги его не слушались - с Бездомным приключилось что-то вроде паралича. (464)

When he tries to take hold of the villains he ends up empty-handed. However fast Bezdomny runs he makes no advance in relation to those whom he pursues. (466-7) Koroviev disappears into a bus, the cat jumps onto a moving tram and the professor escapes through the Moscow streets.

These incidents illustrate how Berlioz' and Bezdomny's encounter with the devil and his companions defies the logic of pure reason. The extraordinary happenings in which the editor and the impatient young man are compelled to partake are connected with the kind of experiences which may be undergone in dreams and nightmares or they may be defined as hallucinations, manifestations of mental illness or a disturbed balance of mind. Thus Woland and his retinue, like Ivan Karamazov's devil, are closely connected with irrational experiences which are comparable to ideas and images conjured up from man's unconscious life in a most vivid and factual manner in dreams. Bulgakov, like Dostoevsky, employs the devil in order to speak out 'in support of the irrational fact' in opposition to absolute reason.

It seems most likely that on the basis of his reading of the Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia¹³ Bulgakov was familiar with its account of Socrates' encounters with the demon who entered the philosopher's reasonable will for the purpose of beneficial inspiration in isolated instances. The Encyclopedia's account is relevant to this thesis as it serves to illuminate the way in which the devil becomes manifest in Master i Margarita and also the purpose for which he appears. A closer look at Socrates' experiences of the demon reveals some further parallels between Ivan Karamazov's devil and Woland.

The demon appeared to Socrates as a tangible being who delivered expedient messages. Plato and Xenophon unanimously testify to the fact that the demon spoke to Socrates through the language of sounds and signs. Because of the tangible form in which the demon became manifest during the moments of inspiration he could not be regarded simply as a voice of conscience or the categorical imperative. Because of the expediency (in the highest moral sense) of the messages received by Socrates these moments of inspiration could not be dismissed simply as hallucinations caused by illness. Plutarch likened Socrates' experiences to what happens to man while he is asleep: although man's external organs relating to the senses are inactive, impressions and inspirations arise from within his soul and these take forms which are perceptible through the organs: images can be seen and sounds can be heard. Thus moments of inner inspiration can be transformed into tangible, external sensations. Plutarch argued that this was happening to Socrates in a wakeful state. Socrates considered the demon's existence to be an empirical fact.

In Master i Margarita Bulgakov, like Dostoevsky in his novel, creates an impression that the devil appears to the characters while they are in a state of wakefulness - even if Ivan Bezdomny thinks that he may have dreamt it all and even if Ivan Karamazov claims that his devil is simply part of his dream or nightmare. Both authors present the devil as a tangible being; for example, in each case his outward appearance is carefully described. Also in both cases the devil's messages are expedient: they are an essential part of the argument with which the characters are at the time preoccupied. The short list of the circumstances in which Berlioz and Bezdomny first encounter the devil and his assistants reveals that 'dreaming in a state of wakefulness' provides a very plausible explanation for these

characters' experience.

The condition of apparent paralysis from which both Ivan Bezdomny and Ivan Karamazov suffer at some point during their meeting with the devil further asserts the plausibility of an explanation which takes into account the dream-like quality of the experience. Paralysis is commonly experienced in dreams in which the dreamer cannot escape a danger because he is unable to move or take action at a vital moment. Ivan Karamazov's paralysis becomes apparent at the end of his encounter with the devil as noises from outside begin to penetrate into his awareness:

Стук продолжался. Иван хотел было кинуться к окну; но что-то как бы вдруг связало ему ноги и руки. Из всех сил он напрягался как бы порвать свои путы, но тщетно. Стук в окно усиливался все больше и громче. Наконец вдруг порвались путы, и Иван Федорович вскочил на диване.
(704)

The dream-like quality of Ivan Bezdomny's experience continues even after his ability to move returns: he walks, and eventually runs, at a supernatural speed without getting any closer to his target. This illustrates that he is still affected by the apparent paralysis described above.

On the basis of his personal experience of the demon Socrates looked beyond rational cosmology towards irrational, even mystical elements, which he saw dominating man's rational motives particularly in certain manifestations of ethical life. That is, Socrates belonged to the group of classical philosophers who spoke out 'in support of the irrational fact' in opposition to absolute reason¹⁴. An attempt is made here to show that this premise, which is put forward in V. Solov'ev's exposition of the ancient philosophers' attitude to demons (as discussed previously)¹⁵, can be seen as the raison d'être of Bulgakov's presentation of the devil in Moscow. In order to under-

stand better the function of 'dreaming in a wakeful state' it is helpful to refer to C. G. Jung's ideas. They reveal a great deal about the irrational elements of human existence which both Bulgakov and Dostoevsky make manifest in the devil and which they demonstrate as undermining the main characters' rational behaviour.

2.4 Dreams and myth-making

It is useful at this point to recall Jung's definition of reason versus myth:

Reason sets the boundaries far too narrowly for us, and would have us accept only the known - and that too with limitations - and live in a known framework, just as if we were sure how far life actually extends. As a matter of fact, day after day we live far beyond the bounds of our consciousness;... The more the critical reason dominates, the more impoverished life becomes; but the more of the unconscious, and the more of myth we are capable of making conscious, the more of life we integrate. Overvalued reason has this in common with political absolutism: under its dominion the individual is pauperized.

The unconscious helps by communicating things to us, or making figurative allusions. It has other ways, too, of informing us of things which by all logic we could not possibly know.¹⁶

It has been noted that both Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's protagonists are advocates of the logic of pure reason and that their devils form the antithesis to this logic, i.e. they represent the 'irrational fact'. According to Jung dreams are a direct issue of the unconscious mind or psyche¹⁷. If it is accepted that Woland and Ivan Karamazov's devil are products of 'dreaming' it is possible to see them also as agents of the unconscious with the task of 'communicating things' to the protagonists and 'informing them of things which by all logic they could not possibly know'.

An attempt will now be made to show that the 'things' of which Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's devils inform the protagonists may be seen as originating from the unconscious regions of the mind. This is

done by reference to Jung's ideas. Jung maintains that dreams can be interpreted on two levels, that is, on an objective and a subjective level:

In the first case the dream is related to what is going on in the environment; the people appearing in it are taken as real, and their relationship to, and possible influence on the dreamer are analysed. In the second case the dream figures are taken as representing aspects of the dreamer's personality.¹⁸

Similarly, the episodes relating to the devil's appearance in Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's novels may be examined on two different levels:

- 1) the level on which the devil is part of the narrative or plot development;
- 2) the level on which the devil is seen to represent particular aspects of the protagonists' personality.

It is the second subjective level of interpretation which is of particular interest to the study of Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's devils.

Reference to Jung's understanding of the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious regions of mind helps to explain what kind of aspects of the protagonists' personality the devils represent in the novels discussed here:

- 1) the personal unconscious contains an individual's 'repressed infantile impulses and wishes, subliminal perceptions, and countless forgotten experiences'; these may be recalled, for instance, through dreams or chance associations;
- 2) the collective unconscious is unconscious in the fullest sense; it represents 'the unknown material from which our consciousness emerges'; dreams and myths are equally important as a fundamental

expression of this level of the psyche¹⁹.

It has already been illustrated how both Woland and Ivan Karamazov's devil are connected with dreams. Their relation to the other 'things' lodged in the unconscious regions of the psyche is also very telling.

In the opening chapter of Bulgakov's novel Berlioz and Bezdomny are discussing the life of Jesus in the light of religions and gods in general. Berlioz informs the young man of the fact that, as with other religions and gods, the story of the progenitor of Christianity is sheer nonsense:

... Иисуса-то этого, как личности, вовсе не существовало на свете и что все рассказы о нем - простые выдумки, самый обыкновенный миф. (425)

Berlioz rejects myths as nonsense. His attack on this topic is stopped by the devil's appearance on the scene. Ironically, as a product of dreaming, the devil is a material, tangible manifestation of ideas which issue from the very region of man's psyche whose reality Berlioz has just denied. That is, the devil, like myths, originates from the mind's unconscious region.

Jung considers myths to be fundamental expressions of human nature. He admits that when a myth is given expression in words, consciousness shapes it, but the essential spirit of the myth comes from the collective unconscious²⁰. The counter-argument to Berlioz' teaching is manifest in the devil's appearance on the scene and it can be substantiated by Jung's statement that:

Because myths are a direct expression of the collective unconscious, they are found in similar forms among all peoples and in all ages, and when man loses the capacity for myth-making, he loses touch with the creative forces of his being.²¹

Myths defy the test of reason and thus they are rejected by Berlioz.

However, the devil's appearance on the scene testifies most forcefully that man cannot suppress or dismiss as irrational urges and ideas which are fundamental expressions of human nature.

In Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's novels the devil is also assigned the task of establishing the protagonists' contact with the creative forces which, according to Jung, reside side by side with man's capacity for myth-making. In both cases this happens by means of a story which the devil relates:

- 1) Ivan Karamazov's devil relates the anecdote of the 'quadrillion years' which Ivan had composed in his youth and then forgotten;
- 2) Woland narrates the opening chapter of the Pontius Pilate story.

In the Pontius Pilate story the most important event of the Christian myth has acquired the hallmarks of Ivan Bezdomny's time and society in the sense that it is presented from the rational point of view as a matter-of-fact statement of the circumstances which led to the execution of Jeshua. In this context the devil must be seen as the agent who penetrates through Ivan Bezdomny's veneer of rational dogmatism and reveals to him the genuine creative aspects of an artist's being which come to manifest themselves - through schizophrenia - in the life of the Master. Thus both in Bulgakov's and Dostoevsky's novels a moment of irrepressible inner stimulation is transformed into a tangible experience which may be traced back to the devil's connection with the unconscious regions of man's mind.

2.5 The devil as a manifestation of the irrational

2.5.1 Introduction

So far the examination of the devil's part in Bulgakov's novel

has concentrated on showing how the devil represents certain aspects of the protagonists' personalities. Arguments which have been presented in the course of this examination indicate that both in Dostoevsky's and Bulgakov's novels the devil issues from the irrational realm of man's mind, that is, from the unconscious part of the human psyche. He acts as an agent, as a catalyst whose task it is to reveal the fundamental ideas and urges of human nature which the protagonists are seeking to suppress in their beings. More attention will now be focused on the ideas which are made manifest through the devil, or in him. In essence it is the purpose of this part of the thesis to show that while the devil is employed by Dostoevsky and Bulgakov 'in support of the irrational fact' in opposition to absolute reason, he is also endowed with the task of supporting metaphysical truth in opposition to the truth distorted by the logic of pure reason.

2.5.2 The spirit of negation

At first it is necessary to establish to what extent Bulgakov's devil represents evil. Some reference to Ivan Karamazov's devil is helpful in this connection. The epigraph chosen by Bulgakov for his novel reads:

... так кто ж ты, наконец?
 - Я - часть той силы, что вечно хочет
 зла и вечно совершает благо.
 Гете, "Фауст". (423)

In Dostoevsky's novel these words of Mephistopheles are recalled by Ivan Karamazov's devil who compares himself to Goethe's spirit of negation:

... Мефистофель, ... засвидетельствовал о себе, что он
 хочет зла, а делает лишь добро. ... я же совершенно
 напротив. Я, может быть, единственный человек во всей
 природе, который любит истину и искренно желает добра.
 (701)

It is reasonable to assume that Bulgakov intended the novel's epigraph to reflect Woland's mission in Moscow. If in the context of this mission Woland is 'forever doing good' why should he 'will evil'? An explanation is offered by the devil to Matthew the Levite who calls the devil 'дух зла и повелитель теней' (775) and refuses to show him any respect. Woland declares that it is necessary even for an emissary from the Kingdom of Light - like Matthew himself - to come to terms with the darker aspects of existence as good cannot exist without evil:

- ... что бы делало твое добро, если бы не существовало зла, и как бы выглядела земля, если бы с нее исчезли тени? Ведь тени получаются от предметов и людей. ... Не хочешь ли ты ободрать весь земной шар, снеся с него прочь все деревья и все живое из-за твоей фантазии наслаждаться голым светом? (776)

The moral opposites would disappear if they could not be measured against each other: good would disappear if it could not be measured against evil.

Ivan Karamazov's devil agrees entirely with Woland on the definition of the mission which the spirit of negation is assigned to undertake in the world. Ivan's devil confesses that there was a moment in his past when he nearly joined in the chorus of "Hosannah" with others. However, he was saved at the last moment by the command of his common-sense attitude to life, by the return of his sense of duty and by the call of his social position. Like Woland, Ivan's devil is acutely aware of society's and the individual's need for a spirit of negation:

- ... подумал я в ту же минуту, - что же бы вышло после моей-то "осанны"? Тотчас бы все угасло на свете и не стало бы случаться никаких происшествий. (701)

Furthermore,

- ... тотчас исчезнет необходимый минус и начнется во всем мире благоразумие, а с ним, разумеется, и конец всему, ... (701)

Both Ivan's devil and Woland put forward arguments in order to justify their mission to negate in the world. These arguments may be summed up in the following dialectical presentation:

1. thesis: good _____ antithesis: evil

synthesis: life

OR

2. thesis: God _____ antithesis: devil

synthesis: people

These two variant dialectics form the philosophical foundation for Dostoevsky's and Bulgakov's preoccupation with evil and they provide the framework for its fictional presentation.

Both in Dostoevsky's and Bulgakov's novels the devils' mission to negate is closely connected with the irrational aspects of man's life. Ivan Karamazov's devil explains:

- ... Каким-то там довременным назначением, которого я никогда разобрать не мог, я определен "отрицать", ... Если бы на земле было все благоразумно, то ничего бы и не произошло. ... Вот и служу скрепя сердце, чтобы были происшествия, и творю неразумное по приказу. (694-5)

When Woland arrives on the scene in Bulgakov's novel all traces of predictability, of the routine order of life disappear from Berlioz' and Bezdomny's safe reality. Woland does not emerge as an invincible, eloquent opponent from the discussion in which he participates with Berlioz and Bezdomny. His task is simply to remind the editor and his disciple of the irrational aspects of life. In fact, both Ivan Karamazov's devil and Woland are entrusted with the role of defying the rational approach to life, of negating the dictates of absolute reason.

In Bulgakov's novel the inadequacy of the rational outlook is further demonstrated in the wording of the rhetorical question put to

Woland by Berlioz:

- ... Ведь согласитесь, что в области разума никакого доказательства существования бога быть не может. (429)

Berlioz is willy-nilly acknowledging the limitations of the rational approach to life as he admits in his rhetorical question that the realm of reason is unable to accommodate any proof of God's existence (or non-existence). At the same time he is, of course, ignoring entirely the existence of regions of mind beyond the realm of reason. Woland ironically congratulates Berlioz on his view, it is easy for him to agree with the editor: God does not reside within absolute reason. The protagonists' rational outlook on life may now be effortlessly negated by means of the devil's irrational influence on the apparent order which characterises their everyday existence. The region from which irrational urges and ideas originate has thus far remained an unexplored territory for Berlioz and Bezdomny.

2.5.3 Man-god versus God-man

In addition to the negation of the purely rational outlook on life both Woland and Ivan Karamazov's devil assert the existence of the metaphysical, spiritual dimension of reality. Berlioz delivers a lengthy lecture to his young companion in order to demonstrate that Jesus never existed as a person on earth. By seeking to establish that Jesus never existed in a tangible or material sense of being, 'как личности' (425) in the physical reality of earth, 'на свете' (425), Berlioz demonstrates his adherence to the view that existence, except as connected with material being, is of no consequence, i.e. it can be dismissed as mythical nonsense. This view accords well with S. Frank's remark that for the radical intelligentsia - as it existed at the turn of this century - material reality was the only reality²².

As pointed out in connection with the introductory discussion on Vekhi the intelligentsia was rapidly going beyond the excesses for which its intellectual progenitor, Ivan Karamazov, was famed. Thus although Ivan's devil rejects the existence of material proofs in this connection, he openly admits the validity of evidence offered by faith:

- ... в вере никакие доказательства не помогают, особенно материальные. Фома поверил не потому, что увидел воскресшего Христа, а потому, что еще прежде желал поверить. ... И наконец, если доказан черт, то еще неизвестно, доказан ли бог? (688)

But the purely materialistic world view of Bulgakov's characters does not concern itself with questions of faith. Allegedly guided by reason and a materialistic outlook Berlioz and Bezdomny embody the characteristics of the 'new man' or the 'man-god' on whom Ivan Karamazov's devil believes the future of mankind to depend. In this 'new man' the metaphysical and spiritual aspects of human nature are totally ignored together with the idea of God.

In Dostoevsky's novel Ivan Karamazov poses the questions and the devil answers them to the best of his ability. He does not, of course, have all the answers: as a manifestation of the suppressed aspects of Ivan's personality the devil has no more and no less information on metaphysical subjects than Ivan himself. In Bulgakov's work Berlioz and Bezdomny provide the answers to the devil's enquiry: they have assumed the role of men-gods by defying the metaphysical dimension of human existence.

Bulgakov depicts in his novel the kind of spiritual desert which Ivan Karamazov's devil envisages as the future landscape of mankind:

- ... надо всего только разрушить в человечестве идею о боге, вот с чего надо приняться за дело! ... Раз человечество отречется поголовно от бога ... то само собою, без антропофагии, падет все прежнее мировоззрение

и главное, вся прежняя нравственность, и наступит все новое. Люди совокупятся, чтобы взять от жизни все, что она может дать, но непременно для счастья и радости в одном только здешнем мире. Человек возвеличится духом божеской, титанической гордости и явится человеко-бог. (702)

This deeply ironic view of mankind's future landscape has been realised in the environment in which Berlioz and Bezdomny profess themselves to be atheists and assert further that the majority of the Soviet population stopped believing in stories about God a long time ago. The extent of the 'divine, titanic pride' of the 'man-god' is fully revealed in the following dialogue which takes place between the devil and Bezdomny:

- ... ежели бога нет, то, спрашивается, кто же управляет жизнью человеческой и всем вообще порядком на земле?

- Сам человек и управляет, - поспешил сердито ответить Бездомный ... (430)

Bezdomny responds to Woland's question angrily with a Soviet cliché. It is obvious that he is anxious to make amends for the ideological departure which is apparent in his poem on Jesus Christ and severely criticised by Berlioz. The lack of tenacity in Bezdomny's adherence to the official Soviet dogma is more extensively illustrated in the section of this thesis which relates to the 'split of Ivan'. At the moment it is sufficient to note that Bezdomny emerges as a more complex character than Berlioz from the very beginning of the novel.

Ivan Karamazov's devil claims that the destruction of the idea of God and the emergence of the man-god may come to pass only if men are willing to do without the sanction of the truth (703). Soviet society and its arch-representative Berlioz have turned away from the truth in the name of reason in order that God may be declared dead and the man-god may reign supreme. However, the less sophisticated character, Ivan Bezdomny, has not yet lost touch entirely with the

truth as it concerns human nature. Consequently, the God-image with which Bezdomny will grow increasingly more familiar in the course of the novel is related not to the idea of the man-god, but to its metaphysical counterpart.

2.6 God-image

At this point in the thesis the function of Ivan Karamazov's devil as a forerunner of Woland's mission in Moscow becomes redundant as the discussion will now concentrate on the God-image which emerges from Bulgakov's novel as a whole. The analysis of Woland's role will be carried out here with reference to C. G. Jung's theories on this subject.

C. G. Jung defines the God-image, its manifestation and its meaning to man as follows:

God-image. A term derived from the Church Fathers, according to whom the *imago Dei* is imprinted on the human soul. When such an image is spontaneously produced in dreams, fantasies, visions, etc. it is, from the psychological point of view, a symbol of the self ... of psychic wholeness.²³

If the God-image is considered as 'a symbol of the self', 'of psychic wholeness', then an individual who ignores or seeks to suppress such an image lacks any understanding of the 'psychic wholeness' of his being. Bulgakov's depiction of Berlioz' and Bezdomny's condition in the opening chapters of the novel reveals that they have no conception of the metaphysical aspects of human existence; that is, they understand their own selves only partially. It has been established earlier that the devil manifests himself to Berlioz and Bezdomny from these characters' own unconscious in order to communicate to them and to inform them of things which by all logic they could not know²⁴. Thus the devil's entry into Berlioz' and Bezdomny's awareness is comparable to a process during which the editor and the poet are forced

to acknowledge the reality of a factual manifestation of the irrational or spiritual potential inherent in every man. Expressed in Jungian terms, the protagonists' conscious will seeks to suppress the archetype of wholeness (i.e. God-image) which manifests itself spontaneously through the appearance of the devil in the sphere which relates to their conscious understanding of the material plane of reality²⁵.

In connection with the discussion on the archetype of wholeness, or the God-image, it is helpful to recall Jung's definition of the concept of the archetype itself:

The concept of the archetype ... is derived from the repeated observation that, for instance, the myths and fairy-tales of world literature contain definite motifs which crop up everywhere. We meet these same motifs in the fantasies, dreams, deliria, and delusions of individuals living today. These typical images and associations are what I call archetypal ideas. ... They have their origin in the archetype, which in itself is an irrepresentable unconscious, pre-existent form that seems to be part of the inherited structure of the psyche and can therefore manifest itself spontaneously anywhere, at any time.²⁶

In Jung's view the real nature of the archetype cannot be made conscious; it is transcendent²⁷. As regards gods and religions in general, Jung considers the central figures in all religions to be archetypal, but asserts that, as in the case of the myths, consciousness has participated in shaping the material through which these figures are presented²⁸.

The Jungian understanding of the archetype relates to Berlioz' and Bezdomny's discussion on gods and religions and on the existence of Jesus Christ, God and the devil in the sense that (as argued by Jung) these subjects keep cropping up constantly; in particular, a self-professed atheist cannot avoid touching upon them. In other words, despite their rationalist and materialist outlook Berlioz and

Bezdomny are talking about religious matters. Poetic irony pervades the editor's reference to myth. In this way the protagonists' consciousness is shaping the material through which these matters are presented, even if its purpose is simply to negate all that the material contains. Irrepressibly the devil emerges to negate the negation, to represent by his very existence the positive aspect of Berlioz' and Bezdomny's negative argument.

In other words, from the editor's and the poet's point of view the devil represents a region of man's mind which does not exist. In accordance with Jung's view, the devil originates from that 'part of the inherited structure of the psyche' whose contents can manifest themselves 'spontaneously anywhere, at any time'. Normally it is not possible to perceive such manifestations from a materialist or rationalist point of view, just as their real nature cannot be made conscious. However, by means of his creative imagination Bulgakov can conjure up the devil who represents just such a manifestation of an archetype. This archetype, i.e. the devil, is Bulgakov's chief witness to the existence of dimensions other than that of material reality. Through the fictional depiction of the prototypes of Christian duality - the devil and Christ/God or Woland and Jeshua - Bulgakov asserts most forcefully the importance of the mind's region from which the archetypes originate.

In this part an attempt has been made to show how man's refusal to understand the metaphysical and spiritual dimension of existence, as depicted in Bulgakov's novel, can be traced through the individual's lost conception of his psychic wholeness, through the severance of his materialist side from spiritual potentialities to an attempt to destroy wilfully the image of God. It has been pointed out that in

Dostoevsky's view the destruction of the God-image inevitably demands the individual's and the whole people's voluntary sacrifice of the sanction of the truth²⁹. The consequences which ensue from the attempted destruction of the God-image will now be more closely examined. The examination will be based on an argument according to which in Bulgakov's novel, paradoxically, the devil acts as the agent through whom the pieces of the broken God-image are discovered anew and the previously suppressed metaphysical truth is reflected on the newly constructed image.

2.7 Knowledge

The consequences of the attempted destruction of the God-image show themselves at the primary narrative level in Berlioz having his head cut off and Ivan Bezdomny ending up in the mental asylum. Both of these events are predicted by the devil and both of them lead the protagonists towards an increased knowledge of that region of humanity the existence of which both of them have sought to ignore. Eventually, Berlioz will come to acquire tangible evidence of the fact that the devil exists and that he exists in defiance of the materialist and rationalist outlook which Berlioz has adopted:

- Все сбылось, не правда ли? - продолжал Воланд, ... - голова отрезана женщиной, заседание не состоялось, и живу я в вашей квартире. Это - факт. А факт - самая упрямая в мире вещь. ... Вы всегда были горячим проповедником той теории, что по отрезании головы жизнь в человеке прекращается, он превращается в золу и уходит в небытие. Мне приятно сообщить вам, в присутствии моих гостей, хотя они и служат доказательством совсем другой теории, о том, что ваша теория и солидна и остроумна. Впрочем, ведь, все теории стоят одна другой. Есть среди них и такая, согласно которой каждому будет дано по его вере. Да сбудется же это! Вы уходите в небытие, а мне радостно будет из чаши, в которую вы превращаетесь, выпить за бытие. (689)

Thus the devil offers Berlioz unquestionable proof of the validity of the theory which stands in opposition to the editor's own philosophy

of rational materialism. The proof offered by the devil is explained in Berlioz' own terms, i.e. it is concerned with facts about the physical reality of 'here and now'.

In Ivan Bezdomny's case, an increased knowledge of the metaphysical aspects of being is acquired through the condition of split personality or schizophrenia, that is, through the introduction of the Master and his Pontius Pilate story into Ivan's life. In this way both Berlioz and Bezdomny come to acknowledge that the devil exists and, hence, they have to acknowledge also the existence of God, because it will now be demonstrated that, in fact, the devil in Bulgakov's novel reflects the God-image which enters into man, not as unity, but as conflict. It is only through the characters' attainment of self-knowledge that the double-sided image can be more clearly perceived.

In the creation myth of the Bible the serpent tempts man to fall into disobedience by promising him knowledge of good and evil. As a result of attaining this knowledge man is expelled from Paradise, his innocence is destroyed. Ever since that moment of disobedience man has had to embrace the consequences of living with good and evil. In his ideas which relate to the individual's attainment of self-knowledge C. G. Jung suggests how to deal with the consequences of the Fall and Original Sin. He writes:

... the individual who wishes to have an answer to the problem of evil, as it is posed today, has need, first and foremost, of *self-knowledge*, that is, the utmost possible knowledge of his own wholeness. He must know relentlessly how much good he can do, and what crimes he is capable of, and must beware of regarding the one as real and the other as illusion. Both are elements within his nature, and both are bound to come to light in him, should he wish - as he ought - to live without self-deception or self-delusion.³⁰

An attempt has been made to show how Bulgakov employs the devil to advance the characters' knowledge of themselves. Thus far the

discussion has concentrated on Berlioz and Bezdomny. It will be shown later that Moscow citizens' knowledge of themselves is also increased in the sense that they are compelled to perceive the truth about evil, as it concerns them, through the revelation of the mystery of black magic.

Jung states that every man should know his capacity for good and evil and, moreover, that he should consider the good as real and the evil as illusion. Bulgakov's novel, as a whole, is in accord with Jung's view. In Master i Margarita the Moscow reality appears as an illusion, while the dimension of existence which relates to the Pontius Pilate story, the Master, Margarita as a witch and the devil becomes the true reality in this work. It can be argued that the novel may be regarded as Bulgakov's exploration of good and evil in himself. The Moscow sections deal with the material reality of everyday life which is strictly regulated by official dogma based on a rational approach to life. In order to survive and continue to write in such an environment Bulgakov had to conform publicly even if privately he was rebelling against the ideological direction of his society.

Bulgakov's predicament is clear from a letter to A. M. Gorky written in September 1929:

Все запрещено, я разорен, затравлен, в полном одиночестве. Зачем держать писателя в стране, где его произведения не могут существовать? Прошу о гуманной резолюции - отпустить меня.³¹

Time after time Bulgakov pleads for permission to travel abroad to get away temporarily from a country which shows nothing but hostility towards his work. He ingratiates, appeals to reason, seeks for humane and just consideration, but he has no success in finding release from the desperate circumstances in which he has to continue

acting without any show of bitterness or frustration. A letter written to a close friend, P. S. Popov, in March 1935 gives expression to this frustration; in this case Bulgakov's frustration is connected with the rehearsals of his play on Molière. Bulgakov is angered by the naive suggestions made to him with regard to the play's text:

Мною овладела ярость. Опьянило желание бросить тетрадь, сказать всем: - пишите вы сами про гениев и про негениев, а меня не учите, ...

Но нельзя, нельзя это сделать. Задавил в себе это, стал защищаться.³²

As he sits down to make the 'necessary' alterations Bulgakov is overwhelmed by deep despair:

Все это примитивно, беспомощно, но нужно. И теперь сижу над экземпляром, и рука не поднимается. Не вписывать нельзя - идти на войну - значит сорвать всю работу, вызвать кутерьму форменную, самой же пьесе повредить, а вписывать зеленые заплатки в черные фрачные штаны! .. Черт знает, что делать!³³

Perhaps the most vivid description of Bulgakov's position is given in his letter to Stalin in May 1931. This expressive statement is quoted at some length:

... на широком поле словесности российской в СССР я был единственный литературный волк. Мне советовали выкрасить шкуру. Нелепый совет. Крашеный ли волк, стриженный ли волк, он все равно не похож на пуделя. Со мной и поступили как с волком. И несколько лет гнали меня по правилам литературной садки в огороженном дворе. Злобы я не имею, но я очень устал ... Ведь и зверь может устать. Зверь заявил, что он более не волк, не литератор. Отказывается от своей профессии. Умолкает. Это, скажем прямо, малодушие.

Нет такого писателя, чтобы он замолчал. Если замолчал, значит был не настоящий. А если настоящий замолчал - погибнет. Причина моей болезни - многолетняя затравленность, а затем молчание.³⁴

It is easy to trace echoes of the Master's predicament to Bulgakov's experience of trying to pursue a creative career in Moscow.

In the novel the Moscow chapters appear as an illusion or a nightmare whose horror may be temporarily concealed in a grotesque, but sinister laughter. It can be argued that the evil which Bulgakov found in himself is reflected in these unreal chapters: a degree of falsity which characterised Bulgakov's life in public represents - in Jungian terms - the evil in which Bulgakov partook in order to complete his novel on Master i Margarita. Bulgakov states above that if a genuine writer lapses into silence, he loses his life. That is why Bulgakov continued to write, aware of the fact that his work would not be published. Thus Bulgakov's private life, connected with creativity and the metaphysical aspects of human existence, came to represent the good which he could do. Master i Margarita gives expression to the paradox which underlay Bulgakov's life: in order to be true to his talent in privacy, Bulgakov had to display some false colours in public.

The way in which the concepts of good and evil are discussed here means that these concepts cannot be any longer defined as absolute ethical opposites of one another. Rather, they may be more meaningfully understood through Jung's view:

The criterion of ethical action can no longer consist in the simple view that good has the force of a categorical imperative, while so-called evil can be resolutely shunned. Recognition of the reality of evil necessarily relativizes the good, and the evil likewise, converting both into halves of a paradoxical whole.³⁵

As a spirit of negation the devil acts as a constant reminder of the paradox of good and evil which characterises both the Moscow environment and the existence on the metaphysical dimension in Master i Margarita. In Moscow Woland wills evil, that is, he draws attention to the evil of dogmatism - be it related to atheism, materialism or rationalism - in order to awaken the characters to recognise the truth

as it relates to the human condition in all its material and metaphysical manifestations. This represents the good which ensues from the revelation of evil.

On the metaphysical dimension the devil's primary target of negation is life itself. To enter this dimension Margarita becomes an invisible witch, the Master leaves his earthly life behind and gives up all hope for the publication of the Pontius Pilate story. In connection with Satan's Ball Woland emerges as a guardian of dead criminals. As regards creativity, Woland enables the Master to retain his link with his creation but he cannot bring the Master's work into life: he cannot aid its progress into the world of material reality. Thus it must be concluded that in Master i Margarita it is the lack of real life which constitutes evil on the metaphysical dimension on which, as it will be shown later, the devil resides.

Yet, in Master i Margarita Woland defends the existence of the shadows and of evil in support of life and good. He asks Matthew the Levite to be reconciled to the paradoxical nature of human existence. Woland's words are aimed to illuminate the conflict which according to Jung embraces 'the opposites within the God-image itself':

The *complexio oppositorum* of the God-image thus enters into man, not as unity, but as conflict, the dark half of the image coming into opposition with the accepted view that God is "Light".³⁶

In the experience of the self it is no longer the opposites "God" and "man" that are reconciled, as it was before, but rather the opposites within the God-image itself.³⁷

Woland's relation to the Kingdom of Light is revealed by his obligation to await the orders from this region as to the final decision on the fate of the Master and Margarita. Matthew the Levite delivers

Jeshua's word to the devil. In this context Jeshua, representative of the good side of the God-image, dominates by giving the order which the devil executes, i.e. Woland serves the purposes of the good. Consequently, on the one hand, Woland must be seen as representing the 'dark half' of the God-image 'coming into opposition with the accepted view that God is "Light"'; on the other hand, it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that Woland does not seek to destroy, but to re-affirm the validity of the God-image: after all, his own existence depends on this image.

2.8 Revelation of myth

Bulgakov depicts Berlioz and Bezdomny in a state of childlike naivety which is characteristic of their absolute belief in reason and materialism. It is this innocent ignorance which leaves the editor and the young poet so unprotected against the devil's invasion. Berlioz rejects totally the importance of myth and instinct and, because of his arrogance, he is shown to lose all control over his life (his life is simply ended). Bezdomny, on the other hand, differs from the conformist Berlioz in the sense that he has produced a piece of writing in which he has unwittingly stepped out of line with the rationalist outlook on life. Deep irony underlies the author's speculation on the circumstances which are responsible for Bezdomny's digression from the official dogma:

Трудно сказать, что именно подвело Ивана Николаевича -
изобразительная ли сила его таланта или полное незнание
с вопросом, по которому он собирался писать, -... (425)

Whether Bezdomny's work on Jesus Christ has been moulded by the 'strength of his creative imagination' or results from his ignorance of the subject matter, it has most certainly not been shaped by the dictates of absolute reason. In an earlier discussion on myths it

was pointed out that according to Jung 'when man loses the capacity for myth-making, he loses touch with the creative forces of his being'. Moreover, Jung views myths as 'a direct expression of the collective unconscious'³⁸. Despite himself Bezdomny has contributed to the vitality of myth by creating in his poem a Jesus Christ who was very much alive; this means that Bezdomny has remained in touch with the unconscious region of his mind in which, according to Jung, creativity resides.

Ideological indoctrination has not succeeded in erasing from Bezdomny's psyche the influence of the unconscious, in which myths are embedded. Bezdomny's example shows that man cannot disregard his instinctive foundations at will. Jung writes that man's 'beginnings are not by any means mere pasts; they live with him as the constant substratum of his existence, and his consciousness is as much moulded by them as by the physical world around him'. According to Jung, the facts which issue from the 'instinctive foundations' are summed up by man under the idea of divinity and their effects are outlined by means of myths³⁹.

In Bulgakov's novel neither Jeshua nor the devil are a myth, but they both aid its revelation, i.e. the discovery of the divine life in man. Through his contribution to the vitality of the myth Bezdomny is aiding the revelation of the idea of divinity; he is giving expression in his work on Jesus to facts which issue from the 'instinctive foundations' of man's being. In this context the devil is a manifestation of the mind's instinctive, unconscious regions, the discovery of which is connected with ambiguous states of awareness, that is, dreaming while awake/asleep. A closer scrutiny of Bezdomny's character reveals that his veneer of materialism and atheism is seriously undermined by flaws which will deliver him into

the mental asylum. The young man's unconscious acknowledgement of the truth whose revelation Woland aids is graphically shown, for instance, by his instinctive action in grabbing hold of an icon and a candle while in pursuit of the devil.

Jung holds that the God-image is very significant for man.

His definition of the mind's relation to this image reads:

The God-image does not coincide with the unconscious as such, but with the special content of it, namely the archetype of the self.⁴⁰

Furthermore he explains that

One can, then, explain the God-image ... as a reflection of the self, or, conversely, explain the self as an *imago Dei* in man.⁴¹

Like other archetypes the image of God is depicted in myths. However, Jung believes that God is not a myth, but myth is the revelation of a divine life in man. Jung is acutely aware of the dilemma which modern man faces as he becomes torn between myth and reason. He advises that 'We cannot and ought not to repudiate reason; but equally we must cling to the hope that instinct will hasten to our aid - in which case God is supporting us against God ...'⁴²

The questions which the devil poses to Berlioz and Bezdomny echo Jung's diagnosis of modern man's predicament:

With childlike naïveté he [modern man] assumes that he knows all his own reaches and what he is "in himself". ... he is utterly unable to separate what he has carefully reasoned out from what has spontaneously flowed to him from another source.⁴³

Bezdomny attains true freedom from absolute reason only as a result of his meeting with the Master, through whom the young man's contact with the creative instinct is openly established.

2.9 Deo concedente

How does Bulgakov's novel as a whole express the significance

of creativity in relation to the divine life in man? Some extracts from Bulgakov's correspondence were quoted to illustrate that in his writing career Bulgakov was faced with conflicting demands⁴⁴. In a sense he was forced to live the lie in public because the truth to which his creative work gave expression was not admissible in Moscow in the 1930's. It can be argued that Master i Margarita represents Bulgakov's creative attempt to depict the moral dilemma of an artist who feels torn by conflicting demands. The novel then becomes the author's voyage of discovery in search of a creative resolution to this conflict. This resolution accords well with Jung's views on God entering man as a conflict.

Jung's theory relating to God entering man as a conflict (connected with the conception of the opposites within the God-image itself and good and evil representing 'halves of a paradoxical whole') has been discussed earlier⁴⁵. In practical terms this theory propounds that the moral absolutes (e.g. good and evil) are not easily recognisable in the sense that they cannot be clearly distinguished from one another: good and evil are not self-evident⁴⁶. In Master i Margarita the devil's character represents the ambiguity of this ethical thinking: he wills out evil in order to advance the purposes of good. For instance, in Berlioz' and Bezdomny's case the good consists of these characters being compelled to acknowledge that the devil exists. With the devil's appearance a whole new dimension of existence is revealed to them beyond the realm of reason.

It is inevitable that the ambiguity of good and evil makes moral evaluation difficult. The way in which Bulgakov's novel embraces this difficulty is most conveniently explained through Jung's statement which asserts that once man becomes aware of the uncertainty of the foundation upon which the conventional code of morality rests

the 'ethical decision becomes a subjective, creative act'⁴⁷. This statement is literally true in Bulgakov's case. Master i Margarita as a whole can be seen to reflect the psychological consequences of Bulgakov's predicament in Moscow in the 1930's. In broad terms, Ivan Bezdomny represents the public aspect of a writer in the new Soviet society while the Master stands for a genuine writer's or creator's private frustration. Through demonstrating that in Moscow good may come only out of evil since only evil is admissible by the dictates of the official dogma the devil establishes the validity of Bulgakov's ethical decision which has been transformed into a 'subjective, creative act' manifest in Master i Margarita.

The devil's part in Bulgakov's ethical decision is further illustrated by reference to Jung's ideas on this subject; according to Jung the validity of such a decision can be established through '*Deo concedente*':

... that is, there must be a spontaneous and decisive impulse on the part of the unconscious. Ethics itself, the decision between good and evil, is not affected by this impulse, only made more difficult for us. Nothing can spare us the torment of ethical decision. Nevertheless, harsh as it may sound, we must have the freedom in some circumstances to avoid the known moral good and do what is considered to be evil, if our ethical decision so requires.⁴⁸

It has been argued that the devil in Master i Margarita emerges from the unconscious part of the psyche. As regards Bulgakov's ethical decision the devil can be seen representing the 'spontaneous and decisive impulse on the part of the unconscious' through which the validity of this decision is established. In this sense Bulgakov's ethical decision is made valid through '*Deo concedente*': good emerges from evil as the God-image is reflected through its darker aspect.

Bulgakov's novel propounds that from Soviet society's point of

view the 'known moral good' - in Jung's terminology - consists of behaviour which conforms wholly to the official dogma of that society, while evil, as has been proposed previously, pertains to those metaphysical and irrational aspects of existence which Woland represents. Accordingly, by writing Master i Margarita Bulgakov must be seen as rebelling to a considerable degree against the behaviour which constitutes the 'known moral good' in his society and in indulging in what the orthodox ideological leaders would call 'evil'. Thus Bulgakov succeeds in attaining freedom from the constraints of his society's ethical code through his 'subjective, creative act'. It can therefore be argued that Bulgakov's search for the divine life in man is guided by his creative instinct which, according to Jung, issues from the unconscious region of mind, i.e. from the devil's dimension. This is how the God-image is reflected through its darker aspect.

3. The devil and the ordinary citizens of Moscow

3.1 Introduction

As a reflection of the dark aspect of the God-image Woland wills evil in order to do good also in the case of the ordinary Moscow citizens. In the previous section an attempt was made to show that in Berlioz' and Bezdomny's case the devil appears in Master i Margarita as a manifestation of the 'irrational fact' in opposition to absolute reason. As regards the ordinary citizens of Moscow the 'irrational fact versus absolute reason' argument is totally reversed as now the devil and his assistants appear in support of a more rational, common sense approach to life than that embraced by the people's unquestioning belief in magic and witchcraft. Accordingly, while in Berlioz' and Bezdomny's case the devil materialises as the

'irrational fact' itself in the rationalists' sphere of understanding, in the case of the ordinary people, he emerges as a detached observer whose attitude to the citizens is characterised by objectivity and whose outlook on magic is defined by common sense and reason. The latter is demonstrated, for instance, by Woland's teasing rejoinder to Andrei Fokitch who has come to complain about the disappearing money:

- Ай-яй-яй! ... да неужели ж они думали, что это настоящие бумажки? Я не допускаю мысли, чтобы они это сделали сознательно. (624)

Bulgakov introduces Woland to Berlioz and Bezdomny 'on their terms', so-to-speak: the devil's existence is a fact and his interest in atheism and powers of reason is very keen; to the ordinary people, who are shown to believe in magic, Woland appears as a magician. As a result of Woland's meeting with Berlioz and Bezdomny the two rationalists are forced to bear witness to the reality of the irrational and metaphysical aspects of human existence; as a result of the black magic show put on by Woland and his retinue at the Variety Theatre the ordinary people are compelled to acknowledge the truth which underlies this magic.

Bulgakov shows in Master i Margarita that magic and witchcraft are part of everyday life in Moscow. They occur mostly either in connection with the citizens' attempts to cover up some petty crimes and corruption or in relation to the people's efforts to come to terms with the political tactics of the secret police. As to how the witchcraft of a totalitarian regime works, plenty of evidence exists and N. Mandel'stam's memoirs⁴⁹ will be quoted later to illustrate how truly the fantastic reality of Moscow as depicted by Bulgakov corresponds to the reality of this city as it was experienced by

honest, genuine individuals in the 1930's. The exposition of the devil's influence on Moscow people shows that in Master i Margarita Bulgakov is not attacking reason in general, rather he is seeking to outline the limitations of an outlook which is based exclusively on absolute reason. As far as the Moscow citizens are concerned Bulgakov is, in fact, making a plea in support of reason by means of which the veil of magic and witchcraft could be lifted and the truth about evil, both on a personal and a socio-political level, would be revealed.

At the turn of the century the radical Russian intelligentsia chose to ignore the wisdom with which life experience had endowed the ordinary people and sought to imprint the tenets of the new materialist/rationalist/utilitarian ideology on the empty canvas with which it identified the people's intellectual and spiritual potential⁵⁰. In Master i Margarita Bulgakov demonstrates just how wrong the intelligentsia was in its understanding of the people. It is true that the Moscow citizens have unanimously turned to materialism but not in the kind of manifestation of this ideology as anticipated by the intelligentsia. Furthermore, with magic and witchcraft as dominant features of their everyday life the significance of the ancient superstitious beliefs has increased, rather than decreased, in Soviet society as presented in the novel. Thus, before turning to the question of how the devil acts as a spirit of negation - as regards magic and witchcraft - and as a catalyst for evil to be exorcised in the case of the Moscow people it is appropriate to discuss briefly the fundamental conception in Master i Margarita of what the citizens are really like.

3.2: The housing problem

Any discussion on what the Moscow citizens in Master i Margarita

are really like must begin with the quotation of the devil's explicit opinion of them:

— ... люди как люди. ... Ну, легкомысленны ... ну, что ж ... и милосердие иногда стучится в их сердца ... обыкновенные люди ... в общем, напоминают прежних ... квартирный вопрос только испортил их ... (541)

This opinion is based on the devil's observation of the people during a black magic show and it reflects his disillusioned, realistic outlook on life: the housing problem has spoiled the citizens! It must be emphasised at the very beginning of this discussion that the housing problem itself is of no significance to the thematic development of the novel. It is the effect of this problem on the ordinary people of Moscow which is relevant to the study of what they are like. In other words, the acuteness of the housing problem which has characterised life in the Soviet Union for the best part of this century is employed by Bulgakov to illustrate the extent to which the ordinary citizens' perspective on such issues as life, death, compassion etc. has become distorted by materialistic concerns.

When the news about Berlioz' death is released it spreads with unnatural speed: 'Весть о гибели ... распространилась по всему дому с какою-то сверхъестественной быстротой, ...' (510). It is not the death of Berlioz that the people feel concerned about, but the vacated housing space which this death has created. The tenants' association chairman is bombarded with pleas which reflect the full extent of the everyday human tragedy; for the applicants the vacated housing space has become a question of life and death. For Maximilian Andreyevich Poplavsky, Berlioz' distant relative, the vacated housing space heralds a possible much desired move from Kiev to Moscow. Thus Berlioz' death fills many people with hope for the future. Needless to say, these hopes are dashed by the irreverent retinue of the devil

whose members become temporarily the occupants of the late editor's flat.

A further dimension is added to Bulgakov's illustration of how such matters as the housing problem has spoiled the Moscow citizens through Poplavsky's encounter with Koroviev which takes place in the disputed flat itself. As Koroviev sobs disconsolately at Berlioz' death conflicting ideas occur to Poplavsky as to the genuineness of these profuse tears:

"Вот, говорит, не бывает в наш век сердечных людей!" - подумал он, чувствуя, что у него самого начинают чесаться глаза. Однако в то же время неприятное облачко набежало на его душу, и тут же мелькнула змейкой мысль о том, что не прописался ли этот сердечный человек уже в квартире покойного, ибо и такие примеры в жизни бывали. (615)

Poplavsky cannot afford to give in either to his own or somebody else's emotions because these emotions could cost him a flat in Moscow. People regard each other with suspicion and mistrust because life in Moscow is dominated by materialism and the individual's acquisition of the largest possible share of goods and comforts available depends on his neighbour receiving as little as possible.

The utilitarian aims of the radical intelligentsia - as depicted in Vekhi - have failed to bring about material happiness for all. Corruption and bribery are commonplace. Like the radical intelligentsia which is depicted in Vekhi, the ordinary people have lost interest in eternal questions for themselves (e.g. life and death)⁵¹. Their genuine contact with fellow human beings has been severed. All for the sake of personal material gain. Thus it can be said that the Moscow citizens have lowered their sights to such a degree that the eternity against which they view their own existence has been transformed into a rich velvet backdrop studded with stars made of golden roubles⁵². This is how Bulgakov presents the lack of

eternal dimension inherent in materialism which prevails in Moscow in the 1930's. Bulgakov makes fun in a most irreverent manner of the fact that the Moscow people are spoiled by materialism. Their love of money which is discussed in the following section illustrates further what they are really like.

3.3 People love money

In his study - with which Bulgakov was familiar - M. A. Orlov writes at great length about the kinds of trickery which the devil plays on people⁵³. Apparently the devil is particularly good at devising pranks which aim to demonstrate the extent of human greed. Money received from the devil turns out almost always to be undesirable. In any case, the devil's generosity mostly proves to be simply 'a trick of the eyes'. Orlov cites numerous examples of incidents which illustrate the unreliability of the devil's magnanimity. At times the money cannot be found at all or it may turn out to be something quite different, e.g. a bear's or toad's claws etc. In Bulgakov's novel the devil and his retinue give a performance of black magic in the Variety Theatre in the course of which the extent of the Moscow people's love of money - and general greed - is vividly demonstrated.

The thematic significance of the black magic performance ensues from the following lines of dialogue:

- ... ведь московское население значительно изменилось? (537)

- ... Горожане сильно изменились, внешне, я говорю, как и сам город, впрочем. О костюмах нечего уж и говорить, ... (537)

- ... сколько гораздо более важный вопрос: изменились ли эти горожане внутренне?

- Да, это важнейший вопрос, сударь. (538)

The latter question is answered through an experiment during which

bank-notes begin to float from the ceiling and the members of the astonished and delighted audience grapple with each other to catch as many of them as possible (539). The smell of the notes convinces the audience that they are genuine; Woland has provided the people with the kind of proof which they best understand.

As Woland observes the chaos around him he replies to his own enquiry:

- ... люди как люди. Любят деньги, но ведь это всегда было ... Человечество любит деньги, из чего бы те ни были сделаны, ... Ну, легкомысленны ... ну, что ж ... и милосердие иногда стучится в их сердца ... (541)

Woland comes to the conclusion that the Moscow people have not changed: they still love money, they are thoughtless, but also compassionate at moments of need. Thus the new Soviet man, as anticipated by the official ideology, has not emerged from the trappings in which he has been bound for centuries. The compassion which the audience shows during the black magic show is directed at a victim of its own cruelty: George Bengalsky, the unfortunate compère of the evening, has his head cut off and put on again at the arbitrary command of this audience. It is interesting to note that the beheading is executed by the devil's crew while the resurrection follows an exclamation: "Ради бога, не мучьте его!" (541).

The magicians establish a ladies' clothes shop on the stage which becomes the showcase of vanity and covetousness within a few seconds of its opening. The magicians have created a situation where the audience participation becomes the act itself while Woland fades into the background simply to observe silently. The women are united in their desire to receive conjured-up gifts. The basic, self-evident dictates of this common desire are clearly communicated even in a

language which is unknown to most of the participants:

... девица с изуродованной шеей ... стала тарыхтеть по-французски, и удивительно было то, что ее с полуслова понимали все женщины, даже те из них, что не знали ни одного французского слова. (544)

The real dialogue takes place on the level of naked greed.

The money conjured up by the magicians turns into labels and strips of paper. The luxurious clothes vanish as soon as the spectators leave the theatre. The money which represents the income received by the theatre in connection with the magicians' performance turns out to be 'hot' foreign currency. If a bear's or toad's claws had tumbled out of the newspaper bundles in which the bookkeeper wrapped the notes the offence would have been less serious. The theatre's bartender seeks out the magician who turns the plain strips of paper back into 10 rouble notes. Eventually some of this money is given by the bartender to a doctor as a payment, but it turns into worthless labels and disappears with the strange nurse who has materialised out of thin air at the doctor's surgery:

Глаза у сестры были мертвые.

- Денежки я приберу, - мужским басом сказала сестра, - нечего им тут валяться. - Сгребла птичьей лапой этикетки и стала таять в воздухе. (631)

Thus Bulgakov's fiction serves to underline the warning against the devil's generosity: undue gifts, particularly money, should be recognised as originating from evil and refused.

When questioned by the bartender about the illusory money Woland reveals quite openly that the exchange of roles between the artist and his audience did not happen by chance. On the contrary, this role exchange provided the motivation for the show in the first place:

- ... Дорогой мой! Я открою вам тайну: я вовсе не

артист, а просто мне хотелось повидать москвичей в массе, а удобнее всего это было сделать в театре. Ну вот моя свита, ... и устроила этот сеанс, я же лишь сидел и смотрел на москвичей. (624)

Through his meeting with the bartender Woland apparently learns more about the Moscow citizens' idiosyncrasies. When he hears that they have used the conjured-up money in place of real money he pretends to be surprised at their naivety:

- ... Я не допускаю мысли, чтобы они это сделали сознательно. (624)

Woland's ironic remark suggests that either the people are thoroughly gullible or that they are crooks; either they are truly taken in by magic tricks or they are swindlers who are knowingly trying to make use of false money. Woland's show parallels in many ways the show trials which took place frequently in the Soviet Union in the 1930's. Except that at the Variety Theatre performance it is the audience's ethical and spiritual condition which is being examined while at the real show trials it was the spectators' political soundness that was being tested. Thus far the Moscow audience has been shown to be wholly materialistic, but also compassionate towards a victim of its own cruelty.

Further illumination on the question of whether the Moscow people are simpletons or crooks is derived from the final moments of the black magic show itself. An individual voice from the audience demands an explanation:

- ... Разоблачение совершенно необходимо. Без этого ваши блестящие номера оставят тягостное впечатление. Зрительская масса требует объяснения.

- Зрительная масса, - перебил Семплеярова наглый гаер, - как будто ничего не заявляла? (545)

Moscow people as a mass have come to accept the incredible without asking for explanations. The power which wields 'magic' in Moscow,

devours those who dare to challenge it with enquiry. The same fate awaits Sempleyarov whose enquiry is turned upon the questioner himself: the scene ends with Sempleyarov's public defamation. At this point it is useful to recall that in connection with the discussion of the devil's genealogy reference was made to the fact that in Bulgakov's novel the rules of conventional morality do not apply; i.e. the truth seekers are unfortunate (evil) and those who are untroubled by self-deception are endowed with happier destinies (good)⁵⁴. The enquiry which the unsuspecting Sempleyarov makes at the show delivers him from the latter category to the former.

3.4 Mystery of black magic and withcraft revealed

The popularity of the black magic show at the Variety Theatre has resulted, not only from the anticipated manipulation of the magic itself, but also from the magicians' promise to reveal the mystery connected with it. The poster advertising the event reads:

Сегодня и ежедневно в театре Варьете сверх программы:

ПРОФЕССОР ВОЛАНД

Сеансы черной магии с полным ее разоблачением (520)

How is the mystery of black magic revealed in the show and what meaning does this revelation bear to the thematic development of the work? It is the voice of Arkady Apollonich Sempleyarov which demands an explanation at the end of the performance. At first the magicians' explanation appears rather weak and inadequate as it consists of the enquiry being turned upon Sempleyarov himself. However, a closer study of Sempleyarov's case provides ample explanation of the origins of black magic and of its mystery as they relate to life in Moscow.

The unravelling of the mystery of black magic begins with the simple question: " ... позвольте вас спросить, где вы были вчера вечером, Аркадий Аполлонович?" (546) It is put to Sempleyarov by Faggot-Koroviev. The outcome of this seemingly harmless enquiry leads to Sempleyarov being publicly exposed as a liar, a lecher and also a corrupt dealer who will share out favours for favours received. The revelation has uncovered the truth about Sempleyarov's whereabouts on the night before the show. Sempleyarov has sought to hide the truth by telling lies. In other words, the revelation of the mystery of black magic consists of the discovery of the truth about Sempleyarov. Consequently, it can be deduced that the sustaining of the mystery of black magic depends on the maintenance of a lie or lies, while the revelation of this mystery depends on an acknowledgment of the truth.

In this context, for example, the reality of the conjured-up money and clothes depends on the willingness of the audience to believe in the illusion, and lie, of magic. When he is told about the Moscow citizens' apparent naivety the devil exclaims:

- Ай-яй-яй! - воскликнул артист, - да неужели ж они думали, что это настоящие бумажки? (624)

The willingness of the audience to believe in this lie, on the other hand, depends on the truth about what they are really like as people, i.e. on their thoughtlessness and greed which are exposed during the show. In the case of Bengalsky's beheading the magic depends on the audience's cruelty. Thus the magic arises and is maintained through the illusion which is sustained by the audience's belief. At this point it is appropriate to recall the devil's dictum: " ... каждому будет дано по его вере." (689) Accordingly, the magic money and clothes turn out to be 'magic', not real or genuine. Sempleyarov

demands the revelation of the magic and he is shown the truth as it concerns him. His individual case is held up as an example of the way in which black magic operates in the wider context of Moscow society.

It can be argued that in Master i Margarita Bulgakov illustrates the way in which a totalitarian regime fosters withcraft and magic which is maintained by lies. In the novel Sempleyarov's case concerns a petty crook's involvement in magic. However, also honest and decent individuals could be drawn into the net of lies as shown by N. Mandel'stam in her memoirs. This gives rise to a question of whether a lie can be justified. In Sempleyarov's case the answer to this question could hardly be in the affirmative. In her works N. Mandel'stam makes repeated reference to the atmosphere of falsehood, and even of absurdity, which inevitably enveloped the lives of those individuals whose honesty came into conflict with a will to survive. As far as Sempleyarov is concerned, it is his success in petty corruption and lechery which depends on his lies. N. Mandel'stam explains what involvement in lies has meant in her own life:

Надо ли лгать? Можно ли лгать? Оправдана ли "ложь во спасение"? Хорошо жить в условиях, когда не приходится лгать. Есть ли такое место на земле? Нам внушали с детства, что всюду ложь и лицемерие. Без лжи я не выжила бы в наши страшные дни. И я лгала всю жизнь - ... И никто мне при этом не верил - это была обычная ложь нашей эпохи, ... Этой лжи я не стыжусь, ... ⁵⁵

Although the kind of lying to which N. Mandel'stam refers in the above statement and the lies of which Sempleyarov is guilty in Bulgakov's novel belong to quite different ethical categories they are both part of the false and absurd atmosphere which prevailed in Moscow in the 1930's.

The justification for the kind of lying of which N. Mandel'stam

writes can be provided by an individual's instinct for self-preservation. She writes:

Улыбаться нам полагалось. Нами руководил инстинкт самосохранения, страх за своих и особый кодекс советских приличий.⁵⁶

In connection with the discussion of Vekhi's ideas some reference was made to the fact that the ancient life experience had endowed the ordinary Russian people with the kind of wisdom which enabled them to come to terms with the totality of human experience⁵⁷. In Bulgakov's novel old superstitious beliefs are employed by the people to explain and to account for the mysterious happenings which take place in their midst. This practice serves a dual purpose. On the one hand, paradoxically, it enables the people to retain some grip on normality as the extraordinary events can be dismissed by reference to supernatural forces and witchcraft. On the other hand, the superstitions and beliefs allow the people to establish the kind of veneer of deception which is described by N. Mandel'stam above: however strange the goings on in the neighbourhood, no actual person or group of people - such as, for instance, the secret police - need be suspected, let alone named, in connection with these goings-on: everything can be attributed to witchcraft. In other words, the citizens can go on pretending that nobody is to blame thus exonerating themselves from the responsibility to challenge the events with enquiry or to acknowledge openly the truth which underlies them. N. Mandel'stam adds that for reasons of self-preservation nobody worried about the absurdity inherent in this pattern of behaviour⁵⁸.

In a chapter entitled 'Nekhoroshaya kvartira' (490) Bulgakov outlines the consequences of witchcraft to the occupants of flat no. 50, in Sadovaya Street. N. Mandel'stam's understanding of the times is

given here as a prelude to Bulgakov's fictional presentation of the Moscow people's attitude to witchcraft:

Все были потенциальными выдвиженцами, потому что каждый день кто-нибудь выбывал из жизни и на его место выдвигался другой. Каждый был, конечно, кандидатом и на гибель, но днем об этом не думали - для подобных страхов достаточно ночи. О выбывших забывали сразу, а перед их женами, если им удавалось закрепиться на части жилплощади, сразу захлопывались все благополучные двери. Впрочем, жен оставалось все меньше - в тридцать седьмом уже начали не только рубить под корень, но и выкорчевывать. ⁵⁹

In Bulgakov's novel old superstitious beliefs and Soviet political tactics have become confused with one another in the ordinary people's understanding. A simple woman explains the disappearance of citizens as follows:

Набожная, а откровеннее сказать - суеверная, Анфиса так напрямик и заявила ... что это колдовство и что она прекрасно знает, кто утащил и жильца и милиционера, только к ночи не хочет говорить. (492)

The author confirms the simple woman's conclusion by remarking that

Ну, а колдовству, как известно, стоит только начаться, а там уж его ничем не остановишь. (492)

The following cases of citizens disappearing are connected with flat no. 50:

- 1) A tenant - whose name is lost - is taken to the police-station by a militiaman; neither of them is ever seen again.
- 2) Another tenant, Belomut, is fetched to work by car as usual, but he never returns and is never seen again.
- 3) This tenant's wife disappears from the flat.
- 4) The owner of the flat goes to her dacha and disappears.
- 5) Anfisa, the simple woman servant, disappears from the flat after a night when unusual goings-on are observed by her in the flat.
- 6) The wives of Berlioz and Likhodeyev disappear from the

flat.

- 7) Berlioz dies an unusual death.
- 8) Likhodeyev is removed to Yalta in most suspicious circumstances.

The explanation for the disappearance is obvious to everybody but since it cannot be openly discussed - often for reasons of self-preservation - the disappearances are shrouded in the mystery of witchcraft. This is particularly true about the first five instances mentioned above. The last three cases differ from the rest in the sense that some information - in Berlioz' and Likhodev's cases a considerable amount of information - is given about the reasons for these disappearances. Yet even these three cases are presented in such a manner that an air of mystery prevails. In general, Bulgakov creates an atmosphere of mystery around these cases by laying emphasis on the fact of the disappearance itself and not on the causes or circumstances which have led to it. This approach allows for the underlying truth to remain unexplored, although it is blatantly obvious in every case.

In particular the first five cases of disappearance mentioned above have a clear imprint of the activities of the secret police. The signs given by Bulgakov make detection of the secret police involvement easy for the reader:

- 1) ... явился в квартиру милиционер, ... (491)
is self-explanatory
- 2) ... жильца (фамилия которого утратилась) ... (491)
perhaps it is not safe to mention this name since the citizen doing so might be implicating himself.
- 3) ... только к ночи не хочет говорить. (492)
the fears gain full reign at night when many arrests

take place.

- 4) ... двери обеих комнат, ... оказались запечатанными. (492)

the doors are sealed so that the police may investigate the tenant's belongings without anyone removing incriminating evidence from the flat.

- 5) ... что будто бы в № 50-м всю ночь слышались какие-то стуки и будто бы до утра в окнах горел электрический свет. (492)

the noises issuing from the flat illustrate the thoroughness of the police search; the electric light speaks of the unnaturalness of what is going on in the night.⁶⁰

In this episode Bulgakov shows that the Moscow citizens believe in witchcraft in the same way as they believe in magic, i.e. by willingly sustaining a veneer of mystery which is supported by lies. Often the citizens' own lives may depend on these lies. In Master i Margarita Bulgakov demonstrates that the Soviet code of behaviour is not based on choosing between the truth and the lie but on the citizens' will to survive in a society controlled by authorities who wield power in the manner of witchcraft.

3.5 Contract with the devil: N. I. Bosoi

In connection with his exposition of what the ordinary people are really like in Moscow Bulgakov presents a number of cases which relate how certain characters make a bargain with the devil. In general, such a bargain is identifiable with the characters getting involved in suspicious and dishonest deals. At first they themselves pretend that they do not know with whom they are dealing. However, the undue benefit which ensues from these deals to the characters makes it obvious that evil is present. In this context the characters'

bargain with the devil must be seen as a conscious act. Furthermore, the bargain with the devil is usually connected with covering up for some petty criminal offence, corruption or lies of which the characters are guilty and whose exposition they fear constantly. To illustrate the above arguments some reference will now be made to the contract made with the devil by Nikanor Ivanovich Bosoi, the chairman of the tenants' association.

When Nikanor Ivanovich Bosoi comes into contact with the devil's crew for the first time he challenges the right of Woland and his retinue to settle in flat no. 50. Bosoi has to pay dearly for this challenge. Afraid of admitting to negligence as regards his duties as the chairman of the tenants' association Bosoi accepts an over-generous offer of rent payment from Koroviev - this will cover up the deficit in the association's funds and thus save Bosoi's reputation as a chairman. The contract concerning this blatantly unfair money transaction is signed by Bosoi with the devil:

... Коровьев с величайшей быстротой и ловкостью начертил в двух экземплярах контракт. После этого он слетал с ним в спальню и вернулся, причем оба экземпляра оказались уже размашисто подписанными иностранцем. Подписал контракт и председатель. (514-5)

As if through a miracle, 'И тут случилось, ... чудо' (515), a parcel of bribe money jumps into his briefcase.

Everything that goes on during the meeting between Bosoi and Koroviev illustrates how little resistance the chairman can muster when faced with corrupt offers of money and privileges. It has already been shown that the money received from the devil leads to unfortunate consequences in Bulgakov's novel. Koroviev, through whom the bargain is effected, reports Bosoi to the appropriate authorities. This suggests that the rent offer may simply be part of a plot against the

chairman. This suggestion becomes even more plausible when it is taken into account that incriminating papers are moved in and out of Bosoi's briefcase in such a way that the chairman cannot avoid getting caught. It is important to note that Bosoi does not question any of the extraordinary circumstances in which he has become involved. When he realises the hopelessness of his situation he begins to blame witchcraft for everything.

A further twist is introduced into the story as the unknown citizen, i.e. the secret police agent, returns to arrest Bosoi's personal enemy Kvastsov who has shown open curiosity and pleasure at the chairman's misfortune. It is not made clear in the novel whether Kvastsov is, in fact, responsible for Bosoi's arrest or whether Bosoi has implicated Kvastsov while being interrogated. It is true that Koroviev makes the initial phone call to draw the authorities' attention to Bosoi, but it has been shown previously in this chapter that the final responsibility for the devilish pranks lies with the Moscow people. The question of who informs on Bosoi and Kvastsov remains open.

Bosoi's case illustrates how the authorities can take advantage of the ordinary citizens' willingness to sustain the mystery of witchcraft. This allows for power to be wielded in a completely arbitrary manner unchecked by any controls. Nobody dares to discuss what is really happening since such discussion would have serious consequences to anyone concerned. As a result of his contract with the devil, i.e. acceptance of undue money, Bosoi is drawn into a vicious circle which traps him in its cycle of nightmares related in the chapter entitled 'Son Nikanora Ivanovicha' (576). The devil's maxim that everyone will receive according to his beliefs applies also to Bosoi and Kvastsov: Bosoi blames witchcraft for his undoing and it

undoes him; Kvastsov takes pleasure in Bosoi's misfortune and falls victim to it himself.

Nikanor Ivanovich Bosoi's contract with the devil, i.e. his partaking in evil as it is manifest in petty corruption, delivers him finally into a mental asylum. However, before that happens Bulgakov depicts - without any direct reference to the secret police etc. - how the confused chairman breaks down at the interrogation which seeks to establish his guilt and also tries to make him implicate others. The interrogation takes place behind closed doors and it foreshadows the open trial which is related in Bosoi's dream. Both the secret questioning and the open trial are connected with the 'witch-hunts' which took place in Moscow in the 1930's and of which a great deal of documental evidence exists. In Bulgakov's novel Bosoi blames witchcraft for the wrongs of which he himself is accused and he becomes the target of a hunt.

When depicting the interrogation scene Bulgakov employs language which wildly understates the reality of the extreme circumstances of such an occasion. He refers to the interrogation chamber simply as 'другое место' (576). Bosoi's vague recollection of the place conjures up the place as follows:

Помнился только письменный стол, шкаф и диван. (576)

The sensationalism of the interrogation is reduced to its minimum in a way which enhances the suggestion of violence and mental oppression as an essential part of the proceedings:

Там с Никанором Ивановичем, у которого перед глазами как-то мутилось от приливов крови и душевного возбуждения, вступили в разговор, ... (576)

In his answers to the interrogators Bosoi refers not only to witchcraft, but also to God - blaming the former and citing the latter as his

witness: "Бог истинный, бог всемогущий, ... все видит, а мне туда и дорога" (576). Neither witchcraft nor God satisfy the interrogators' thirst for information. They are looking for concrete answers which will lead to concrete arrests. Bosoi's confusion and terror make him resort to religious primitivism which renders him useless to his interrogators. To them Bosoi's behaviour signals severe mental disturbance.

In the mental asylum Bosoi dreams of an open trial in which he is called to appear. The accompanying table shows how this trial parallels the black magic show at the Variety Theatre.

Revelations of mystery:

show / trials

Woland's show

Bosoi's dream

Theatre, compère + Fagot and assistants.	Theatre, compère.
Audience = performers.	Audience = performers.
Purpose: to demonstrate that ordinary people are thoughtless and compassionate, they love money.	Purpose: public confession.
Sempleyarov draws attention to himself and comes to be held up as an example.	Bosoi called upon to show example to others.
Sempleyarov comes to participate in the act without prior warning.	Bosoi called to appear without prior warning.

Woland's show

Bosoi's dream

<p>Truth revealed in the final number: " ... разрешите еще один крохотный номерок?" (545) (Sempleyarov's case.)</p>	<p>Truth revealed in the final number: " ... позвольте мне на прощанье, показать вам еще один номер из нашей программы, ..." (581) (Dunchill's case.)</p>
<p>As a result of the revelation Sempleyarov is publicly humiliated and defamed.</p>	<p>The individual's failure to confess means that he is publicly humiliated and defamed.</p>
<p>The revelation of the mystery of black magic consists of the discovery of the truth about evil in Moscow citizens.</p>	<p>The example of confession is employed to expose corruption and, more important, to reaffirm the validity of the ideologically correct truth.</p>

It must be emphasised that both the show and the trial attempt to reveal the truth: in the former instance, the truth is concerned with the discovery of what the Moscow people are really like and, in the latter, it is connected with the revelation of how the citizens have transgressed against official dogma. While the black magic show brings out what is good and evil in the citizens, the trial of which Bosoi dreams highlights the sham morality which underlies the ethical tenets of the official ideology. An attempt will now be made to illustrate how didactic instruction, not the implementation of justice, is the primary purpose of the 'show' which takes place in Bosoi's dream.

The stage set at the trial presents a mockery of eternity in the way in which the night sky and the stars are depicted on its curtain:

Имелась сцена, задернутая бархатным занавесом, по темно-вишневому фону усеянным, как звездочками, изображениями золотых увеличенных десятков, суфлерская будка и даже публика. (578)

The juxtaposition of this false, materialist eternity with the kind of eternity described at the end of Bulgakov's earlier novel Belaya gvardiya⁶¹ reveals the true extent of Bulgakov's despair:

... а вот звезды останутся, когда и тени наших тел и дел не останется на земле. Нет ни одного человека, который бы этого не знал. Так почему же мы не хотим обратить свой взгляд на них? Почему? (270)

The stars to which the audience at the trial turns their eyes are made of golden coins. This illustrates the degree to which the sights of the Moscow citizens have been lowered in Master i Margarita.

The significance of the prompter's box at the stage set of the trial is painfully obvious in the context of confessions whose extraction is the purpose of this show. The furniture on the stage consists only of one armchair and a small table. The audience consists entirely of men: ' ... Никанора Ивановича посетило сновидение, в основе которого, несомненно, были его сегодняшние переживания' (578). In the dream the earlier interrogation is transformed into a show trial. The purpose of the proceedings is to humiliate and instruct the accused through the act of public confession. He is held up as an example to his fellow citizens: " ... Никанор Иванович, покажите нам пример,"... (579). Each case is intended as a public reaffirmation of the official dogma.

The audience participation is lively. As Bosoi is called forth the crowd accompanies the invitation with friendly applause, but when he utters his first words "Богом клянусь, что ..." (579) in reply to

the compère's request to give up the foreign currency the audience has changed its attitude:

... весь зал разразился криками негодования. (579)

The success of the act depends on whether Bosoi confesses to the alleged crime or whether he fails by insisting on being innocent. Bosoi blames black magic for everything and, like the interrogators in the earlier scene, the compère dismisses the chairman's act:

- ... я-то на вас надеялся. И так, номер наш не удался. (580)

Bosoi's performance is vociferously condemned by the crowd.

To illustrate in more detail how the audience's reactions reflect the official dogma it is helpful to refer to a speech given by V. I. Lenin in 1920⁶² in which he remarks that the communists are accused of repudiating all ethics. Lenin admits that they do repudiate ethics in the sense that it is preached by the bourgeoisie, i.e. the ethics based on God's commandments. Moreover, he admits to the communists disregarding all morality which is derived from non-human or non-class concepts. He claims that the communists do not believe in an eternal morality; their morality is wholly and exclusively related to the creating of a new communist society. In connection with the introductory discussion on Vekhi the ethics of nihilism was mentioned as an essential part of the Russian intelligentsia's socialist credo. S. Frank stated that the guiding principle of these ethics centres on the assumption that the material reality is the only reality⁶³. Lenin's definition of ethics relates closely to the ethics depicted by Frank as part of the radical intelligentsia's ideology at the beginning of this century.

Through Bosoi's example Bulgakov shows that the artificial transformation of 'eternal morality' into a single-minded adherence to the

materialist/rationalist/utilitarian tenets of right and wrong makes a mockery of the individual's understanding of truth and falsehood. The matter becomes even more confusing to the individual because at the trial it is the act of confession, rather than the implementation of justice, which forms the climax of each performance. Bosoi's dream theatre in which the show trial takes place is a parody of any meaningful court proceedings. Paradoxically, the trial which is presented as a dream in Bulgakov's fiction is very typical of what was going on in reality in Moscow in the 1930's. The trial is symptomatic of the spiritual paralysis which affected even the conception of morality in the new uni-dimensional Soviet society.

In Bosoi's case an injection of sedative dispels the memory of the trial at which he has been called to appear as a result of his contract with the devil. The nurse calms him down with the assurance that

- Нету, нету, ... а на нет и суда нет. (587)

For a time Bosoi has been compelled to deal with the consequences which ensue from his involvement in petty corruption. Fortunately for him, however, the whole episode concerning the devilish influence on his life can be dismissed as a bad dream.

4. Conclusion

By introducing the devil into his novel Bulgakov attacks dogmatism, be it religious, scientific, social or political. In Master i Margarita dogmatism is considered as an attempt on the part of reason to establish a final pattern on life, to express the absolute, infallible truth. In this way dogmatism, as a rule, is seen to restrict the characters' responses to life because it indoctrinates them to follow its command. Berlioz' and Bezdomny's behaviour bears witness to this kind of indoctrination: their understanding is limited and

their individual freedom reduced. It has been argued that the devil is employed to demonstrate the illusory nature of the security and order on which the editor and the young poet rely as a result of their unquestioning acceptance of the rational outlook on life. Berlioz and Bezdomny attain knowledge of the suppressed aspects of their own values and of life in general.

In the case of the ordinary Moscow people - who are presented in the novel both as a mass and as individuals - the devil's influence leads towards increased self-knowledge: through the devil's agency the veil of magic is lifted to reveal the mystery which envelops the truth about evil, as it concerns each individual and through him the society as a whole. It is true that in the epilogue everything that happens while the devil stays in Moscow is dismissed as a remarkable experience of mass hypnosis. However, there is no doubt that in the course of the novel the Moscow people have been confronted, even if only temporarily, with their own true image which they do not wish to perceive. In the first section of this chapter the devil is shown to appear to Berlioz and Bezdomny as a manifestation of the 'irrational fact' which stands in opposition to absolute reason: the editor and his 'disciple' are compelled to acknowledge the reality of the dimension of human existence in which they do not believe. As regards the ordinary Moscow people the devil advocates a more common-sense attitude to life than is apparent in their outlook, but the people wish to cling onto magic and witchcraft for the purpose of explaining the cause of their misfortune.

In Moscow everyday existence is shown to depend on the maintenance of lies and falsehood on which the status quo is founded. The devil's influence is connected with the characters' attainment of the kind of knowledge which serves to undermine these foundations. In this con-

text the characters' increased self-knowledge in Bulgakov's novel refers to them being at least temporarily made aware of the evil of lies and falsehood on which they rely. This is the truth which is revealed by the devil. C. G. Jung states that the answer to the problem of evil can be found 'first and foremost' through the attainment of self-knowledge, i.e. the individual's utmost knowledge of his wholeness, of good and evil in him⁶⁴. In Master i Margarita the devil and his retinue are employed for the purpose of providing this answer, be it against the characters' willingness to acquire it.

The knowledge which the devil imparts in the novel threatens the relationship between the governing élite and the people. P. Kropotkin highlights the importance of mystery in relation to knowledge for the society as a whole when he explains that the first fragments of knowledge, which appeared a long time ago and which were connected with witchcraft, also became a power that could be used (when possessed by an individual) against the tribe. These fragments were kept in secrecy and they were known only to the circle of the initiated. Such practice is found to be common amongst all savages⁶⁵. On the other hand, at the end of the Grand Inquisitor legend⁶⁶ Ivan Karamazov puts forward a proposition which extends the significance of the mission carried out by the Inquisitor as follows:

- ... может быть, этот проклятый старик, ...
существует и теперь в виде целого сонма многих таковых
единых стариков и не случайно вовсе, а существует как
согласие, как тайный союз, давно уже устроенный для
хранения тайны, для хранения ее от несчастных и малосильных
людей, с тем чтобы сделать их счастливыми. (287)

Kropotkin's reference relates to the circumstances of a primitive man living in a savage society. Ivan Karamazov's proposition links medieval Spain with Russia as seen by Dostoevsky in the latter half of the 19th century. In both cases knowledge guarded by secrecy and

disguised as witchcraft and mystery has provided certain individuals with the power which they have come to wield over the people. In Bulgakov's novel such power is wielded in the manner of magic. Bulgakov shows that Soviet political tactics which are incomprehensible to the ordinary people, but which are wholly sanctioned by the élite's superior knowledge of the official dogma, can only be explained by the people in terms of superstitious beliefs.

It is evident from Kropotkin's, Dostoevsky's and Bulgakov's exposition of secret or exclusive knowledge versus power that a harmonious relationship between the élite and the people depends on the willingness of both sides to sustain the mystery in which the knowledge is shrouded. This thesis has tried to demonstrate that the purpose of the devil's and his assistants' visit to Moscow is to confront the people with the knowledge of the truth about evil as it concerns them individually and socially. Under the guise of magic the individual can relinquish all responsibility for what happens to him or his fellow citizens. The ruling élite is satisfied with the apathetic disposition of the people towards questions of moral responsibility. Bulgakov's argument parallels the claim presented in the Grand Inquisitor's legend:

... овладевает свободой людей лишь тот, кто успокоит их
совесть. (279)

In the society depicted by Bulgakov the people's lives are governed by an élite which, like the Grand Inquisitor, conquers and holds captive the conscience of the masses by the forces of 'miracle, mystery and authority'⁶⁷. It provides the citizens with material necessities but chooses to ignore their spiritual needs. It wields plenty of magic and exercises a great measure of authority. These three forces enable the people to attain the kind of 'happiness' which ensues from the

115.
relinquishment of responsibility regarding freedom to choose between good and evil.

Yet, it should not be forgotten that under the Grand Inquisitor's rule heretics burn daily as a matter of course and in Bulgakov's novel witchcraft which is held responsible for people disappearing is accepted as commonplace. The question arises whether the people are voluntarily relinquishing their responsibility for the freedom to make moral choices or whether they are, in fact, doing so only because they wish to avoid being thrown onto the pyre. After having heard the legend Alyosha Karamazov exclaims:

- И кто тебе поверит о свободе? Так ли, так ли надо
ее понимать! (285)

In this chapter an attempt has been made to show that in Master i Margarita the citizens' belief in magic and witchcraft helps to preserve the status quo and to increase their chances of 'survival'; conveniently for them, this belief justifies the maintenance of the lies to which the conscience of the Moscow people is bound.

Alyosha Karamazov declares that the mystery which the Grand Inquisitor so zealously guards contains nothing at all or, at most, the idea of godlessness. Thus Alyosha regards Ivan's legend as being in praise of Jesus, not in disparagement of him as evidently intended by Ivan. (Ivan Karamazov and Ivan Bezdomny have missed the target in their respective works on Jesus in a similar manner.) The Grand Inquisitor's godlessness is apparent in his lack of regard for human beings as discussed earlier in the introductory chapter on Vekhi⁶⁸. He acknowledges the metaphysical aspect of human existence to the extent that he provides the masses with a false Christ who is manifest in his own personality, but he does not believe in the masses' ability to deal with freedom. In Master i Margarita the

devil is assigned the task of restoring the metaphysical aspects of human existence for which the official ideology lacks regard. Freedom, particularly as it relates to choosing between good and evil, is necessarily curtailed by the dictates of the official dogma. Illusory and precarious freedom is upheld by lies and falsehood which are shrouded in magic and witchcraft.

In concluding this discussion on the devil versus the rational man and the superstitious masses in Master i Margarita, it seems appropriate to refer to the challenge which Berdyaev makes at the end of his Vekhi essay:

Мы освободимся от внешнего гнета лишь тогда, когда освободимся от внутреннего рабства, т.-е. возложим на себя ответственность и перестанем во всем винить внешние силы. (22)

The truth about evil whose revelation the devil aids in Bulgakov's novel illustrates well why Berdyaev's challenge remains unanswered by the ideological leaders of Soviet society.

CHAPTER FOUR:

Writer versus society

1. Introduction: the theme of the double

It is helpful to introduce the discussion on the theme of writer versus society in Master i Margarita¹ by making some general reference to four of the novel's characters who are directly connected with literature:

- 1) Berlioz - a senior editor who commissions literary works and advocates strict obedience to the official guidelines on creative writing.
- 2) Ryukhin - a poet who is also a conformist but who admits to himself that Ivan Bezdomny's insulting words about him contain the truth:

"Правду, правду сказал! ... не верю я ни во что из того, что пишу! ..." (489)
- 3) Bezdomny - a young and immature verse writer who tries to follow the official dictates in his writing but is found to digress, unwittingly, from the correct path in his work on Jesus Christ.
- 4) The Master - a genuine artist who has written a novel following only the dictates of his creative instinct; as a result of this 'offence' he has become excluded from life in Moscow and the artist in him has died.

In this list the characters are arranged according to the degree to which their work conforms to their society's ideological demands on literature. This arrangements reveals the extent to which the different characters are affected by the conflict between the official demands on creativity and the private yearning for the presentation of the truth as each of them understands it. An attempt is made in this chapter to show that in Bulgakov's novel this conflict is expressed, not only through the different characters' predicaments, but also

through the juxtaposition of one character with another. In this way one ignites the process leading to the other's recognition of the truth, however brief or transitory this recognition may be.

The most obvious instance of this technique is manifest in Ivan Bezdomny's schizophrenia (the Master versus Ivan), which is studied in detail in this chapter. It is argued that the Master aids Ivan's discovery of the truth as it relates to genuine creativity. Similarly, Bezdomny can be seen as the instigator of the process which leads to Berlioz' enforced confrontation with the truth: the devil shows him in a very 'tangible manner' that life after death exists. It is Berlioz' attack on Bezdomny's work which conjures up the devil in the first place. Bezdomny also compels Ryukhin to admit to himself the truth about his inept verses. The originality of Bulgakov's presentation of a particular character versus his opponent is apparent in the way in which this juxtaposition reflects the conflict between the public and private lives of a writer/writers in Soviet society. The originality is, however, built upon a tradition which had been employed by 19th century Russian writers, particularly by Dostoevsky: it is the theme of the double. Thus Ivan Bezdomny's schizophrenia is treated here as the 20th century manifestation of this traditional theme.

The theme of the double occurs repeatedly in the Romantic fiction of E. T. A. Hoffmann - whose fantastic stories greatly influenced the Russian writers in the early part of the 19th century. Interest in Hoffmann was reawakened at the end of the last century when the Russian Symbolists became drawn to German Romanticism. During the time that Bulgakov was engaged in writing Master i Margarita (1928-'38) Hoffmann was recognised in the Soviet Union as a popular classic and he was hailed particularly for his satirical portrayal of the German

bourgeois society of his time². I. Mirimsky's article on 'Sotsial'naya fantastika Gofmana'³, published in 1938, which Bulgakov is known to have read eagerly, reflects to a considerable extent the official Soviet attitude towards Hoffmann. M. Chudakova notes that numerous phrases and even whole paragraphs of this article have been heavily underlined by Bulgakov with a red pencil⁴.

Mirimsky's article deals primarily with the theme of the double as presented in E. T. A. Hoffmann's fiction, as reflected in his divided characters and also in his own personality and life. Many ideas discussed by Mirimsky relate closely to thoughts which had pre-occupied Bulgakov in the 1930's and which find expression in Master i Margarita. Thus it seems appropriate that some reference should be made to Mirimsky's article in this part of the thesis which deals with the dichotomy of human existence manifest in Bulgakov's novel in the theme of writer versus society.

2. Art and life

Some of Bulgakov's letters were cited earlier to illustrate that his creative life was seriously frustrated by the official demands made by his society on literature⁵. The first section of Mirimsky's article on Hoffmann which Bulgakov underlined heavily deals with the conflict between the duty of the bread-winner and the will of the artist. Hoffmann suffered acutely from this conflict in his own personality: he likened his civil service career to the rock to which Prometheus became chained; his soul and spirit were devoted only to art⁶. Bulgakov also lived a double life: on one level, he was involved in work which conformed to the official directives on literature; on another level, he worked as a creative writer who remained true to himself and who, no doubt, thought that his genuine work would never be

published. At the end of his life Bulgakov even agreed to write a play about Stalin's youth. It has been suggested that this was because he wished to provide his family with some hope of future security (at the time Bulgakov was very ill and knew that he would not live long)⁷. In his article, which was published in 1938, Mirimsky writes about the fate of an artist in bourgeois society at the very time when, paradoxically, Bulgakov and many others were sharing Hoffmann's predicament in a society of socialist orientation. The fate of an artist in a philistine society is one of the principal themes in Hoffmann's fiction and this thesis attempts to show that it is also one of Bulgakov's primary preoccupations in Master i Margarita. It must be emphasised, however, that the purpose of this study is not to illustrate how Master i Margarita reflects the biographical circumstances of Bulgakov's life. Rather, it tries to illuminate the moral dilemma affecting a genuine artist in a society whose understanding of the human condition is blinded by a strictly dogmatic outlook.

In their works both Hoffmann and Bulgakov show the artist's yearning for peace. According to them in a philistine society a true creative artist attains peace only in the world of dreams where his divided self is no longer torn between the demands of life and art. In Hoffmann's case this is illustrated well in a story about a talented conductor, Johannes Kreisler⁸. Here Hoffmann evokes the ghost of a great composer, Glück, who has died in 1787, in order to demonstrate how tragic and solitary the artist's life has become in Hoffmann's own contemporary Berlin. Since Glück is an apparition the conflict is easily resolved in his case: he returns to the non-material world. In the story Hoffmann presents Kreisler as a tangible counterpart to Glück's spirit. Kreisler emerges as a noble romantic, an incorruptible musician and enthusiast who is doomed to live in the wilderness

of egoism and philistinism.

Kreisler's predicament and the appearance of Glück's spirit correspond to the way in which the dichotomous characters of Ivan Bezdomny and the Master are portrayed in Bulgakov's novel. There too the conflict between art and life forces the artist to withdraw from the material reality of Moscow, first into tragic loneliness and then into the world of dreams. The peace which both Hoffmann's and Bulgakov's protagonists acquire is not attended by the kind of clarity or light which preoccupied both of these authors: at the end of Hoffmann's story Glück retires into the visionary world and Kreisler goes mad; in Bulgakov's novel the Master is led to the limbo of oblivion and Ivan Bezdomny comes to suffer from periodic attacks of lunacy.

Thus, like Hoffmann, Bulgakov writes in his novel about the destiny of the artist who, torn by the conflict between art and life, begins to lead a dual existence in which his personality becomes divided. In psychiatry this schizophrenic condition is defined as a hallucinatory state, in which the sick person feels that his being has split. Mirimsky's explanation of how this condition is manifest in Hoffmann's works helps us to understand Bulgakov's treatment of the same theme:

Основной чертой творческого метода Гофмана, ... является сознательно подчеркнутая и обнаженная двуплановость в показе действительности. ... Два плана - реальный и фантастический или, ... филистерский и энтузиастический - могут выступать в произведении Гофмана то раздельно, то слито, но они всегда различимы во всем, начиная от образов и кончая речевым строем.⁹

This conception of two levels of existence relates closely to the most obvious case of divided personality in Bulgakov's novel, i.e. the case of Ivan Bezdomny. In the chapter entitled 'Razdvoenie Ivana' (530)

Bulgakov depicts how in the isolation of the mental asylum a 'new' Ivan is born and how he meets the Master.

3. Ivan's schizophrenia

The immature poet Ivan Bezdomny appears at the very opening of Master i Margarita and is also present on the final pages of the work where he is called Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov and described as a member of the Institute of History and Philosophy. He is the pivotal character of the work around whom the structure of the narrative revolves. In the beginning Bezdomny occupies the material Moscow reality, but his meeting with the devil and also with the Master and Margarita transports him onto the metaphysical dimension from which he returns to the material reality in the closing chapter of the novel. Thus, in a sense, Master i Margarita can be seen as a deeply ironic depiction of the process through which the young poet Ivan Bezdomny becomes a mature Soviet scholar, Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov. Here the interest is focussed on the study of this process where the division of Ivan's personality is most explicitly presented. It is argued that Ivan Bezdomny and the Master can be seen as different aspects of a writer's consciousness. It is helpful to begin with a presentation of a chart which shows these two characters as counterparts:

Ivan Bezdomny:	The Master:
1. homeless;	1. nameless;
2. author of the poem about Jesus Christ;	2. author of the Pontius Pilate story;
3. criticised for presenting Jesus as a real person;	3. criticised for presenting an apologia for Jesus Christ;
4. asylum: taken there against	4. asylum: enters voluntarily

Ivan Bezdomny:

- his will (in a lorry);
5. at first, verse writer;
6. later, scholar of history
and philosophy;
7. wife: guardian of Ivan's
sleep, brings peace through
sedation;
8. memory revived in dreams
which follow attacks of
lunacy.

The Master:

- (hitches a lift in a lorry);
5. at first, historian (by train-
ing);
6. later, writer;
7. Margarita: guardian of the
Master's sleep, calms him down
with her words, induces sleep;
8. memory fades into oblivion.

How do these factors - as they are juxtaposed with one another - express Bulgakov's understanding of the dilemma concerning writer versus society as presented in Master i Margarita? An attempt is made here to show that they point towards a condition of split personality with which Bulgakov identifies the writer's predicament in Soviet society in the 1930's.

The Pontius Pilate story has been written by the Master who enters the novel in the chapter entitled 'Razdvoenie Ivana' (530). Ivan Bezdomny is also a kind of writer; he is an immature poet who has written a longish narrative poem about Jesus Christ. Allegedly, this poem has succeeded well:

Трудно сказать, что именно подвело Ивана Николаевича ...
но Иисус в его изображении получился ну совершенно как
живой, хотя и не привлекающий к себе персонаж. (425)

Bezdomny is severely reprimanded by his senior editor because the work digresses seriously from official ideological directives as regards the person of Jesus Christ: it is not important to show what Jesus

was like, but it is vital to demonstrate that Jesus as a person never existed at all.

The Master's Pontius Pilate story has also been attacked mercilessly by publishers and critics. One of these attacks parallels closely the kind of criticism directed at Ivan by his editor. Ivan listens as the Master recalls the painful facts:

... появилась статья критика Аримана, ... в которой говорилось, что Иванов гость, ... сделал попытку проташить в печать апологию Иисуса Христа. (559-60)

The subject matter of the Master's work has been extensively attacked by the critics, but it is this accusation of vindicating the existence of Jesus Christ (not of Jeshua Ha-Notsri) which parallels most closely Berlioz' reaction to Bezdomny's work.

Like the Master, Ivan has ended up in the asylum because of his involvement with the Pontius Pilate story. Ivan remarks:

- Видите ли, какая странная история, я сижу здесь из-за того же, что и вы, именно из-за Понтия Пилата, ... (552)

Thus Ivan and the Master have both written on the same 'character' and their works have been dismissed by official opinion. It is true, of course, that the dismissal and its consequences are far more serious in the Master's case.

The biographical information relating to Bezdomny corresponds in a curious manner to details revealed in the novel about the Master's life. At the beginning of the work Bezdomny is presented as a young, immature poet writing - modishly - under a pretentious pseudonym. Many more such pseudonyms are mentioned in the episode dealing with the Griboyedov party. Such examples as Pavianov, Bogokhulsky, Sladky etc. (477) show that Bulgakov ridicules the practice of adopting pretentious pseudonyms while at the same time using them to

delineate the characters to whom they belong. Thus it seems reasonable to assume that also the pseudonym 'Bezdomny' is intended to define Ivan's character.

It has been pointed out earlier that in Bezdomny's case the official ideological indoctrination has simply endowed the young man with a veneer of conformity whose vulnerability is most clearly demonstrated by the very fact that Bezdomny's work on Jesus Christ has blatantly digressed from the official guidelines. It can be argued that Bezdomny is 'homeless' in Moscow in the sense that he has not yet succeeded in suppressing the commands of his instinct in a society which demands the individual's unquestioning adherence to a materialist and rationalist outlook. Although a self-professed atheist Ivan still involuntarily clings to an icon when the circumstances so demand. Ivan is 'homeless' in Moscow because, despite his own relentless efforts to do so, he is unable to conform fully to the ideological order on which the status quo in the city depends.

The Master's 'homelessness' in Moscow is a more serious matter. He has voluntarily renounced both his real-name and his life in the city. He tells Bezdomny:

- У меня нет больше фамилии, - с мрачным презрением
ответил странный гость, - я отказался от нее, как и вообще
от всего в жизни. Забудем о ней. (553)

His beloved Margarita has bestowed the title of the Master upon the novel's hero and it is the only name by which he wishes to be identified¹⁰. This illustrates the extent to which the Master has become alienated from life in Moscow: in public he is rejected as a writer and could never be acknowledged as a Master.

In the closing chapter of the novel Bezdomny appears as an employee of the Institute of History and Philosophy and he is referred to as Professor Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov. In the asylum the Master

tells Bezdomny that he is a historian by education and used to work in a museum until the time when he won 100,000 roubles which enabled him to devote all his time to writing. Thus in the course of the novel Bezdomny is transformed from being an immature verse writer into a scholar of history and philosophy - while the Master leaves the discipline of history in order to take up writing.

In his work Bezdomny has sought to conform to the official directives on literature; the Master's writing has been guided purely by his creative instinct. Bezdomny has worked in public and the Master has remained in seclusion and privacy. By the time these two characters meet the Master has stopped writing and at the very first meeting Bezdomny promises, as the Master asks him, never to write his dreadful verses again. Bulgakov parallels and juxtaposes these two characters with one another in order to show how a 'public' writer's life compares with that of a genuine artist. The way in which the lives and the personalities of the two writers converge upon one another begins to emerge more explicitly from the moment when Bezdomny urges the Master to continue telling his life story and also that of Pontius Pilate: from then on the Master's life and work begin to dominate Ivan Bezdomny's existence.

The argument that Ivan Bezdomny and the Master may be viewed as different aspects of a writer's consciousness is substantiated by a closer examination of how Bezdomny's condition of schizophrenia comes about, i.e. how the division of his being and consciousness is affected. The 'split of Ivan' happens in the asylum after Doctor Stravinsky injects him with a sedative and he drinks some hot milk; as promised by the doctor the reality of Jerusalem begins to fade from Ivan's memory and the events in Moscow connected with the devil lose their importance.

Bezdomny begins to come to terms with his present circumstances.

The muted night-lights and the moon bring peace to him. His personality starts to divide as he speaks to himself:

- 1) Ivan's first piece of monologue is interrupted by an observation that Ivan speaks 'обращаясь к кому-то' (532).
- 2) The dialogue which follows - 'вдруг сурово сказал где-то, не то внутри, не то над ухом, прежний Иван Ивану новому,...' (532) - establishes clearly that the conversation is taking place between two separate characters, i.e. the old Ivan and the new Ivan.
- 3) The reality of the new Ivan is acknowledged through an oblique reference to a phenomenon which reflects the tangible and psychological nature of the protagonist's second self: 'Подремав немного, Иван новый ехидно спросил у старого Ивана ...' (533).
The new Ivan emerges as a character whose psychological and tangible existence has been more than adequately verified.
- 4) The devil's bass voice intervenes without disturbing, and just at the threshold of sleep and wakefulness the Master - in whose character the genuine creative instinct is manifest - enters into Ivan's awareness¹¹.

As predicted by the devil in the opening chapter of the novel Bezdomny has come to suffer from schizophrenia in the course of which his contact with the creative instinct is established through the character of the Master.

It becomes apparent from Ivan's conversation with the Master in the chapter entitled 'Yavlenie geroya' (547) that the immature writer's personality has split in such a way that the old Ivan

represented the public personality of a conformist writer while the new Ivan is a manifestation of his suppressed private self which has begun to emerge as a result of the meeting with the devil. This private self had been suppressed to such an extent that the thoughts, ideas and feelings pertaining to it are almost unrecognisable to Ivan. The Master's character, which appears to Ivan while in an ambiguous state of consciousness, can be seen as a further symptom of the young writer's 'illness' since it serves to enhance the reality of the suppressed self. In this way the devil has acted as a catalyst through whom Bezdomny's hidden self is conjured up.

4. The Master

It is argued in this thesis that the Master's entry into the novel occurs as a consequence of Ivan Bezdomny's schizophrenia; in other words, he may be seen as a direct manifestation of Ivan's illness. In this context it is interesting to note that throughout the work his appearances are connected with the non-material dimension of existence:

- 1) Thus the Master enters into the narrative for the first time when Ivan Bezdomny is just on the point of falling asleep in the asylum (533).
- 2) He is mentioned briefly at the end of the chapter about Nikanor Ivanovich Bosoi's dream: Bosoi's shouting evokes the Master's memories of the last autumn night of his life - 'последнюю в жизни осеннюю ночь' (587).
- 3) The Master appears next in Part II of the novel in Margarita's dream which portends the fulfilment of his destiny (643).
- 4) The Master is resurrected by Margarita's wish which 'extracts' him from the asylum as if by magic (700).

- 5) The Master flies through the air, with Margarita, to return to the asylum to say good-bye to his disciple Ivan Bezdomny; when they arrive Ivan is lying motionless and watching the thunder outside (this takes place while, in the material dimension, the Master dies a physical death in the room next door) (789-91).
- 6) For a while the Master and Margarita exist together on a dimension which is connected both with the material and the non-material planes.
- 7) Eventually they retire into the oblivion of lifeless existence
- 8) from which they return only to appear in the happy dreams of Professor Ivan Nikolayich Poniroyov (811).

The Master's appearances are mostly conjured up by states of consciousness connected with sleep and dreaming or - as regards Margarita's wish and the aftermath of its fulfilment - by witchcraft and magic. In this way the Master, like the devil, may be seen as a manifestation of the suppressed impulses residing in the human psyche: in Ivan's case the impulses which the Master represents relate to creative instinct. Through the Master - and the devil - Bulgakov portrays human existence as a manifestation of conscious, semi-conscious and unconscious forms of experience. Such existence is not limited to the understanding of only the material reality but it embraces also the spiritual and psychological dimensions of man's being. In other words, the Master may be seen as a catalyst through whom Ivan's latent creative personality is connected with the semi-conscious and unconscious regions of existence from which, according to Jung, the instinctive creativity ensues¹².

However, the Master is also suffering from divided personality. In the first place, his whole existence is divided in the sense that he lives (and dies) quite separately in the world of material reality and on the metaphysical dimension of being. The Master's connection with material reality is shown through his and through Margarita's memories, of the time when he lived as a writer in Moscow. It is evident in the fact that he dies a physical death in the asylum. This is reported by the nurse, Praskovya Fyodorovna, to Ivan. The point at which the Master's personality has begun to split is marked by the moment of his completion of the Pontius Pilate story. The Master explains:

И, наконец, настал час, когда пришлось покинуть тайный приют и выйти в жизнь.

- И я вышел в жизнь, держа его в руках, и тогда моя жизнь кончилась, ... Он повел дальше свой рассказ, но тот стал несколько бессвязен. Можно было понять только одно, что тогда с гостем Ивана случилась какая-то катастрофа. (558)

The catastrophe which has happened to the Master marks the resolution of the conflict between art and life in his case: the Pontius Pilate story has been mercilessly attacked, the Master is arrested and the artist in him dies. After serving his sentence, he enters voluntarily into the seclusion offered by the mental asylum where he continues to exist, even to live, in his memories of the past life in Moscow.

Till the Master's encounter with the official world's reception of the Pontius Pilate story his personality has remained undivided: both his life and art have revolved around the domesticity of a cosy basement flat and around the love affair which has been clandestine, but pure. Innocent naivety characterises the Master's attitude to the world outside. This explains to a great extent his apparent unpreparedness (and looking ahead, also that of Jeshua) for the outside

world's reception of his work, or ideas. Like Hoffmann's character Kreisler¹³, the Master identifies the truth conceived by an artist with the truth as it relates to the material reality of being and unavoidably enters into a struggle against philistine society. As with Kreisler, the Master's struggle has culminated in a duel between the artist and the state (i.e. individuality versus conformity) in which the artist dies. It is important to note that the Master has entered into this struggle unwittingly through his art. Ivan's case parallels that of the Master in the sense that he, too, has unwittingly rebelled against the official dogma; his rebellion results in temporary madness. Like Hoffmann's protagonist, the Master becomes increasingly enclosed within himself (looking ahead, the same happens to Pilate) and is finally driven by extreme despair to withdraw into the asylum.

Bulgakov looks for the final resolution of the conflict between art and life on the 'fifth dimension' where the devil resides. On this dimension space and time may be altered to any desired degree; here the artist's creative imagination may roam unrestrained and free of the limitations of the material reality. In the next chapter, an attempt will be made to show that ironic romanticism - rather than romantic irony - characterises the Master's release from the confines of his earthly existence to the devil's realm.

5. Recovery

The fates of Ivan and the Master converge again in the closing chapters of the novel. Both acquire peace, Ivan through medical sedation and the Master through Jeshua's intercession. In both cases it is sleep which brings about harmony in the protagonists' minds and their wives become the guardians of their sleep.

Earlier in the novel the Master's beloved Margarita has a dream

in which the Master appears in a place whose lifeless character is repeatedly emphasised:

Приснилась неизвестная Маргарите местность - без-
надежная, унылая, под пасмурным небом ранней весны.
Приснилось это клочковатое бегущее серенькое небо, а
под ним беззвучная стая грачей. Какой-то корявый мостик.
Под ним мутная весенняя речонка, безрадостные, нищенские
полуголые деревья, одинокая осина, а далее, ... (634)

The early spring landscape of Margarita's dream is lacking any promise of nature's regeneration. There is no hope, no sound nor joy in this unknown place¹⁴. This lifeless limbo or no man's land is compared to hell:

Неживое все кругом ... Ни дуновения ветерка, ни шевеления
облака и ни живой души. Вот адское место для живого
человека! (634)

The dream heralds the lovers' reunion which does not, however, take place in this lifeless desert but in the devil's domain where the Master's and Margarita's eternal home will be found. It is a place which is at once curiously parallel to and different from the hellish scenery described above.

Silence is the most dominant attribute of the eternal landscape depicted at the end of the novel. When Matthew the Levite informs the devil of the decision passed upon the Master's destiny he says:

- Он не заслужил света, он заслужил покой, ... (776)

Jeshua who issues from the realm of light or absolute truth has read the Master's novel which - as the final chapter of this thesis tries to show - reflects the view that

Recognition of the reality of evil necessarily relativizes
the good, and the evil likewise, converting both into
halves of a paradoxical whole.¹⁵

In other words, in the Pontius Pilate story the good which ensues from the recognition of the absolute truth, as represented through Jeshua's character, is depicted by the Master in relation to Pilate's predica-

ment in Jerusalem. Because of the paradoxical, not absolute, conception of ethics which arises from Pilate's and Jeshua's dependency upon one another (these characters emerge as 'halves of a paradoxical whole') the Master is excluded from the realm of light and led into the shadowy sphere of peace. Furthermore, the Master has lived as a voluntary exile from the world with his knowledge of good and evil. The devil promises that everyone will receive according to his beliefs and thus the peace which the Master has attained through his withdrawal into the asylum becomes more complete in the limbo at the end of the novel where his disturbed memory is submerged in sleep and oblivion.

Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov, who is now an employee of the Institute of History and Philosophy, lives in Moscow with his wife. He no longer uses his pseudonym Bezdomny; he is no longer 'homeless' because now 'он все знает и понимает' (808). That is, Ivan has been initiated, or indoctrinated to conform to the norms which govern the life of the society in which he lives. In the opening chapter of the novel the indoctrination took place through Berlioz instructing the young man and it has been accomplished by means of the cure administered to Ivan in the asylum. Ivan has come to understand even the erratic wanderings of his mind at the time of the full moon when the 'vagrant' of Ivan's personality is awakened anew. As a result of this, Ivan's contact with the vagrant and the hero of the Master's story is renewed (this time the names of Jeshua, Christ or Pilate do not appear in the writing).

Ivan's circumstances form an ironic parallel to those of the Master. The Master knows and understands everything, i.e. he knows about the devil. Ivan's knowledge, on the other hand, relates to the fact - as he has been brought to believe - that his acquaintance with the devil has resulted from hypnosis. The Master is also brought

into contact with Jeshua and Pilate at the end of the novel: once only, so that he can release the Roman from his limbo of yearning to be with Jeshua. Ivan's contact both with Jeshua and Pilate and with the Master and Margarita is renewed at every full moon.

With the epilogue the narrative of Master i Margarita completes a full circle: it ends where it began. Ivan goes back to Patriarch's Ponds and retraces his steps to the bench where he sat and listened to the devil's tale on the evening of Berlioz' death. Then he continues to walk to the Gothic house with a private garden where Margarita lived during her lifetime in Moscow. He does not understand why this house attracts him so powerfully, but he knows that he will always return there at full moon. Ivan, now a respectable citizen, is no longer a schizophrenic: he has arrived at a full understanding of the Moscow reality as his home. The manifestations of his unconscious self, i.e. the devil and the Master, have departed from Moscow. Ivan still suffers from bouts of lunacy for which there is no final cure but which can be kept under control through medication.

In the course of the novel Ivan's experience of the Moscow reality has been undermined by events and phenomena which are inexplicable in terms of a rational outlook on life. The treatment which he has received in the mental asylum has succeeded in constraining his understanding of human existence back within the confines of that outlook from which he becomes liberated only during the attacks of lunacy and the dreams which follow these attacks. At such moments the impulses which issue from the irrational regions of the psyche, from the unconscious bedrock of creativity, enter once more into Ivan's awareness without his being able to comprehend their full significance.

Both Ivan Bezdomny and the Master attain peace at the end of the novel. The Master's peace consists of silence - 'тишина', 'беззвучие' (799) - which prevails in the shadows of his eternal home and of oblivion brought about by sleep. Margarita promises him:

- ... ты будешь засыпать ... Сон укрепит тебя, ты станешь рассуждать мудро. А прогнать меня ты уже не сумеешь. Бережь твой сон буду я. (799)

Similarly, Ivan returns home from his obsessive wanderings in Moscow and his wife becomes the guardian of his sleep. Margarita talks warmly about the candle-light which will burn in the lovers' eternal abode, while Ivan's wife sits by the lamp with a book and a filled hypodermic needle. The full moon is present both in Moscow and on the dimension on which the Master now resides. The coming of the dawn is emphasised in both instances. In the Master's case Margarita's words, which 'струи́тся так же, как струи́лся и шептал оставленный позади ручей' (799) begin to flood his awareness so that gradually his tortured memory grows calm: 'память мастера, беспокойная, исколотая иглами память стала потухать' (799). The Master's restlessness is dispelled by means of a spiritual cure, that is, Margarita's words. In Ivan's case it is the injection which brings peace to the sufferer. Ivan's memory is also pierced with needles in the sense that hypodermic needles have been used in the asylum to wipe away his memory of the devil. In this context the needles are applied to extinguish the memory of a disturbing experience. In a figurative sense, however, an image of memory pierced with sharp needles is obvious: it refers to an irresistible recollection of a painful experience. In essence, it is the recollection of their shared experience of the Pontius Pilate story that Ivan and the Master find so disturbing.

The reason why both Ivan and the Master experience pain at the recollection of this story is that both of them have failed to stand up for the truth which they know this story to contain. In a sense both of them have given in to the critics of Christ/Jeshua: Ivan forsakes his efforts to try and prove that the curious events connected with Woland and the Pontius Pilate story ever took place at Patriarch's Ponds; the Master has tried to burn his manuscript. The official medical case histories of these patients' mental condition might conclude simply that a patient who called himself the Master died a peaceful death and Ivan Bezdomny was discharged as cured from schizophrenia. On the other hand, if examined from a point of view that takes into account the metaphysical dimension of human existence, a different statement would apply:

- 1) Ivan's case: those aspects of being which the devil and the Master represent die in Ivan's personality as a result of the treatment and are resurrected only at the time of annual attacks of lunacy and dreaming;
- 2) the Master's case: the Master is being resurrected through the agency of his muse or inspiration, Margarita, and he continues to exist in a limbo.

Thus Ivan's life becomes fully integrated with the material reality of Moscow; the Master's contact with this reality grows increasingly more distant in the course of the novel and, ironically, at the end the Master is connected with the city only through Ivan's dreams.

In some ways Ivan's painful experience of the Pontius Pilate story is reminiscent of the anguished development of Zamyatin's hero D 503 into a mature, whole human being in the anti-utopian novel My¹⁶. D 503 wants to conform to the dictates of the One State, but despite himself he falls victim to enemy forces which conjure up the

irrational aspects of his personality. His diary entries digress from the norm, he has dreams, he acquires a soul, his memory becomes active and his fantasy comes to life. Similarly, Ivan digresses unwittingly from the official path. He is open to unacceptable influences, because reason has not yet been established as the sole guiding principle in his life. The symptoms of Ivan's disease correspond to those of D 503's illness. In the end both Ivan and D 503 return to normality as understood by their respective societies.

Zamyatin's and Bulgakov's preoccupation with the dilemma of the divided personality is different in each author's case in the sense that Bulgakov ascribes a great deal more significance to the function of memory than Zamyatin does. At the end of Bulgakov's novel the Master and Margarita are walking towards their eternal home and watching the promised dawn when the Master's memory begins to fade and he begins to feel free. At the same time, i.e. at dawn following a full moon, Ivan becomes disturbed in his Moscow flat, he has an injection and, as if out of the dawn, the Master and Margarita return to his awareness in his dream. Margarita promises the Master that in the eternal home: " ... ты будешь засыпать с улыбкой на губах" (799). In the same way there are repeated references in the novel to the fact that after the sedative Ivan 'будет спать до утра со счастливым лицом' (810). Thus both the Master and Ivan become happy and peaceful when they are asleep. Paradoxically, the Master's happiness coincides with his memory fading in his sleep, while Ivan acquires such happiness only after he has been reunited with his memory in a dream and, more particularly, only after the pain has been dulled by an injection. As the sedative takes effect the Pontius Pilate story is continued a little further in Ivan's dream:

- ... какая пошлая казнь! Но ты мне, пожалуйста,

скажи, ... ведь ее не было! Молю тебя, скажи, не было?

- Ну, конечно, не было, ... это тебе померещилось.

- И ты можешь поклясться в этом? ...

- Клянусь, ...

- Больше мне ничего не нужно! (811)

The Master asked Ivan earlier to create a continuation to the story and Ivan does this in his dream. Ironically, Ivan's contribution is in accordance with the official opinion and would have pleased Berlioz well as it brings the story to a conclusion which asserts that, in fact, the Jerusalem execution never took place. This assertion brings peace to Ivan:

Наутро он просыпается молчаливым, но совершенно спокойным и здоровым. Его исколотая память затихает, и до следующего полнолуния профессора не потревожит никто. (812)

6. Reasoning in a circle

This thesis has sought to argue that the final resolution of the conflict between life and art in Moscow in the 1930's is manifest in the paradox which characterises the intertwined destinies of Ivan and the Master. The memory which these characters share concerns their experience of the Pontius Pilate story. Bulgakov depicts this experience from the point of view of a divided personality whose opposite aspects are realised in the characters of Ivan and the Master. Ivan represents the public personality of a writer who has apparently lost touch with his creative instinct. The Master appears to him as a genuine manifestation of this instinct and, for a time, in the asylum, Ivan's existence becomes dominated by the Master's visits. In order that Ivan may be cured of his schizophrenia the Master has to die as his very existence is symptomatic of the illness. At the end of the novel Ivan returns to his routine life in Moscow from which art,

as represented by the Master's character, has been almost entirely excluded; the little that remains is identified with Ivan's annual bouts of lunacy.

Furthermore, Ivan's epilogue to the Pontius Pilate story betrays the truth which the Master had woven into his work in the form of the unresolved paradox of good and evil. Ivan concludes the Master's story in a manner which agrees single-mindedly with the official view that the Jerusalem execution never really took place - just as, according to the official view, Jesus Christ never really existed as a person. The irony of this reasoning in a circle¹⁷ lies in the fact that Jeshua himself has to be resurrected in Ivan's dream to bear witness to his own 'non-death'. In this context Master i Margarita may be viewed as a suicide note written by Bulgakov, the artist, who then becomes resurrected by means of the note itself. Thus the conflict between art and life is presented in Bulgakov's novel as an unresolved paradox - like the truth contained in the Pontius Pilate story - at which the author also has arrived through circular reasoning.

The theme of a writer versus society is explored by Bulgakov through the presentation of the above-mentioned paradox which underlies the conflict of life and art in relation to creativity. A true artist's predicament in Soviet society is reflected in Bulgakov's work in the shared consciousness of Ivan and the Master. Bulgakov shows how a writer who tries to conform to his society's dictates and seeks to give expression to his private artistic impulse becomes endowed with a consciousness which is divided between his public and private personae. These two personae remain in serious conflict with one another as each is constantly seeking to suppress the other's influence. It is important in this context to note that both Ivan's and the Master's experience of the Pontius Pilate story is presented in the novel in a

way which may be indicated as

memory - to forget - oblivion

and not as

conscience - to forgive - absolution.

This apparent lack of ethical dimension in the treatment of one of the main themes of the novel which purports to be philosophical seems astonishing at first sight. However, it is this very lack which, on the basis of circular reasoning, comes to reflect the spiritual paralysis affecting Soviet society as depicted in this work. In other words, a true artist who wished to stay alive and write in Moscow in the 1930's was forced to lead a double life; that is, he had to conform in public in order to be able to continue his creative activity in private. To do so was no longer a question of right and wrong; it had become a matter of survival.

In these circumstances a writer - like the Master - was forced to betray the issue of his own creativity if he himself wanted to survive and there was no way for him to seek forgiveness for such a betrayal nor to be absolved from carrying responsibility for it; the betrayal simply had to be forgotten, engulfed in oblivion if the writer was to gain any peace of mind. Thus Bulgakov shows in his novel that although the psychological consequences of the writer's betrayal of his own work cannot fail to affect his conscience, memory, and not conscience, must be seen as the most immediate obstacle to the attainment of peace of mind. In this context the lack of ethical dimension in the treatment of the theme of a writer versus society in Master i Margarita serves to enhance, rather than diminish, the power of the novel's philosophical content which relates to the truth as it concerns the existence of a genuine creative intelligence in a spiritual wilderness.

CHAPTER FIVE:
The devil's domain

1. Introduction

This chapter is given to the study of 1) the devil's dimension and 2) Margarita's role in the novel. These two topics are being dealt with in the same chapter because in the course of the novel Margarita becomes inextricably bound up with the devil's world and thus it would be difficult to examine her character without taking into account her connection with the devil. In Master i Margarita¹ the devil's domain is situated on the 'fifth dimension' whose significance in the novel's cosmology will be illustrated here. P. Florensky's explorations in geometry² are employed to demonstrate the way in which existence on the 'fifth dimension' relates at once to life in Moscow and to fantasy. The viewpoint which the 'fifth dimension' affords at the world of material reality is shown to give some important insight into the forces by which men's destinies are manipulated. The thematic significance of Margarita's character is explored at the end of this chapter. This exploration is intended as a preliminary introduction to the final section of the thesis where the revelation of the novel's philosophical kernel is sought through a detailed study of the Pontius Pilate story, the issue of the Master's creative act, which is inspired by Margarita in a very particular manner and which is retained in the safety of the devil's dimension.

2. The 'fifth dimension'

2.1 Location

The 'fifth dimension' is first mentioned in Master i Margarita by the devil's assistant who explains its magic possibilities to Margarita:

— ... Тем, кто хорошо знаком с пятым измерением, ничего не стоит раздвинуть помещение до желательных пределов. Скажу вам более, уважаемая госпожа, до черт знает каких пределов! (666)

Koroviev's statement reveals two important facts:

- 1) on the 'fifth dimension' any place existing on the material plane can be altered to any desired size;
- 2) the devil knows well how to handle the 'fifth dimension'.

When writing his novel Bulgakov was greatly fascinated by P. Florensky's work entitled Mnimosti v geometrii: Rasshirenie oblasti drukhmernykh obrazov geometrii.³ In his work Florensky studies the application of the idea of 'fictitious parallels' to geometric forms (e.g. to triangle, square). Koroviev's statement contains a suggestion that the 'fifth dimension' in Master i Margarita corresponds to a space which exists on the material plane. This accords well with Florensky's interpretation of the imaginary. He is concerned with the discovery of the 'opposite', imaginary side of the plane. He writes:

Мнимый отрезок относится, согласно этой интерпретации, к противоположной стороне плоскости; там находится своя координатная система, в одном случае совпадающая с действительной, а в другом — расходящаяся с нею. Для нас теперь, ... плоскость стала прозрачной, ...⁴

In Bulgakov's novel the 'fifth dimension' is rooted in reality but sustained by fantasy. It is the dimension on which the devil resides and Margarita becomes a witch.

Koroviev's reference to the 'fifth dimension' is intended as a jocular explanation of how the proportions of a perfectly ordinary Moscow flat can be altered to an unrecognisable degree. Everybody is dividing up rooms (yet another indication of the housing shortage) or 'working miracles' to create extra living accommodation:

— ... Я ... знал людей, не имевших никакого представления не только о пятом измерении, но вообще ни о чем не имевших никакого представления и тем не менее проделывавших совершеннейшие чудеса в смысле расширения своего помещения. (666)

The magic, which is made manifest at the Variety Theatre through the

people's credulity, has become commonplace in Moscow and is employed by the citizens also to alleviate the housing problem. As far as flat No. 50 is concerned, the devil and his retinue are simply indulging in the same kind of magic as the rest of the Moscow citizens. However, the miracle worked by the devil turns out to be far superior to the changes effected by ordinary citizens. Some measure of Woland's excellence at turning a temporary residence into a mansion fit for a devil is revealed by Margarita's first impression of the flat.

As she enters Margarita is overwhelmed by the subterranean darkness: 'Ничего не было видно, как в подземелье, ...' (664). Furthermore, she is struck by a wide staircase opening up in front of her: '... эта необыкновенная невидимая, но хорошо ощущаемая бесконечная лестница' (665). Margarita and Koroviev ascend to a landing from where they proceed towards a huge hall, dark and seemingly endless, and decorated with a colonnade. Finally the two companions reach Woland's room and as the devil beckons Margarita to step forward she feels that she is walking on air: 'Та подошла, не чувствуя пола под босыми ногами' (670). The changes which are put into effect by the devil and his assistants in flat No. 50 elevate it onto a new dimension.

Bulgakov's presentation of the 'fifth dimension' corresponds closely to the idea of 'fictitious parallels' which Florensky envisages in his study as the non-material, imaginary opposites of given spaces existing on the material plane. This correspondence is most graphically illustrated in the paragraph which describes Margarita's and Azazello's entry into the building where flat No. 50 is situated and also into the flat itself. In order to reach the flat it is necessary to ascend a common stair - Bulgakov explains that Margarita and her companion climb up to the third landing. However, as they enter the flat itself Margarita feels that she has arrived at a dark, sub-

terranean place. Then she begins to ascend the invisible, endless staircase. Margarita and Azazello have thus entered onto the 'fifth dimension', the 'non-material, imaginary opposite of a given space existing on the material plane'. On this dimension the reality or the material nature of matter does not disappear but, rather, its manifestation acquires a new meaning:

... провал геометрической фигуры означает вовсе не уничтожение ее, а лишь ее переход на другую сторону поверхности и, следовательно, доступность существам, находящимся по ту сторону поверхности, так и мнимость параметров тела должна пониматься не как признак ирреальности его, но - лишь как свидетельство о его переходе в другую действительность.⁵

This provides a possible explanation for the fact that Margarita cannot feel the material reality of the floor in the devil's room even under her bare feet. Florensky affirms that 'Область мнимостей реальна, [и] постижима, ...' ⁶.

The vast staircase of flat No. 50 is reintroduced in the chapter which deals with Satan's Grand Ball:

Маргарита была в высоте, и из-под ног ее вниз уходила грандиозная лестница, крытая ковром. Внизу, так далеко, как будто бы Маргарита смотрела обратным способом в бинокль, она видела громаднейшую швейцарскую с совершенно необъятным камином, в холодную и черную пасть которого мог свободно въехать пятитонный грузовик. Швейцарская и лестница, до боли в глазах залитая светом, были пусты. (679-80)

The guests emerge from the fireplace and ascend the stairs to reach the level at which the rout takes place. Perhaps Bulgakov intended the fireplace to represent a lower level of hell from which the ragged dead appear; or, perhaps, the fireplace simply provides a convenient access for those guests who arrive flying through the air and thus enter through the chimney. As soon as the bodies land in the hall they are transformed and ready for a dignified ascent which leads them to greet the Queen of the Ball.

Although grotesque, this ascent of the multitude of guests up the stairs, men in tailcoats, women naked apart from shoes and a few extraordinary accessories, shares some of the exhilaration of the movement upwards experienced by the poet in Dante's 'Purgatorio'. This exhilaration is particularly marked in Dante's work as it is opposed to the disquieting descent which the poet had made previously into the 'Inferno'⁷. Similarly, in Bulgakov's work the ascent by the guests, who are 'resurrected' for the Ball, is juxtaposed with Margarita's first arrival in the flat when she was engulfed in subterranean darkness. Furthermore, in Dante's 'Purgatorio' the poet's journey is taken in daylight (as opposed to the subterranean shadows of the 'Inferno'), while in Bulgakov's novel the stairs are bathed in blinding light which makes one's eyes ache.

The 'fifth dimension' of Bulgakov's novel thus acquires some of the characteristics of the Dantean cosmology, but these characteristics are distorted to such an extent that they give birth to a new phantasmagoric cosmos which is unique. The view that 'Both hell and purgatory are, in Dante's concept, part of the physical world and part of our own earth'⁸ accords with Florensky's understanding of 'fictitious parallels'. (In fact, Florensky uses the example of Dante's and Virgil's journey in the Divina Commedia to illustrate his theory about the fictitious and the imaginary.)⁹

In this context it is possible to argue that Bulgakov conceived Satan's Ball as a 'fictitious parallel' to the Griboyedov party, described in a chapter entitled 'Bylo delo v Griboedove' (470). Moreover, the midnight vision of 'hell' and the devil at the Griboyedov party itself may be seen as yet another 'fictitious parallel' of reality, that is, a 'parallel' which relates to the reality, or unreality, presented in Socialist realist literature. The Griboyedov 'hell' and

its romantic hero are sustained by fantasy in its most deceptive, corruptive form and juxtaposed with the harsh truth about the cold and ugly reality outside the party.

2.2 Satan's Ball/Griboyedov party

Satan's Ball takes place in flat No. 50 which belongs to a dead man, the senior literary editor Berlioz. The Griboyedov party is held in a two-storied house which is in the possession of the MASSOLIT. This house and its staff cater for the members' needs, which are exclusively to do with their physical pleasure and well-being. Both venues have a literary connection. Further correspondences between the Satan's rout and the Griboyedov 'hell' are most conveniently shown as follows:

Griboyedov party:	Satan's Ball:
Exotic, lavish decoration of rooms.	Ditto, only in a greater measure.
Rooms pulsating with jazz.	Music conducted by Johann Strauss.
Happens at midnight.	Ditto.
Abundance of food and drink.	Ditto, guests bathing in pools of champagne etc.
The restaurant manager appears as a romantic vision of a buccaneer; metamorphosis: he returns to acting as the restaurant manager.	Woland: the ragged figure of Woland appears to meet the guests; metamorphosis: he acquires the appearance of a hero from the

Griboyedov party :	Satan's Ball:
	past.
Guests, writers, are sinners who have offended against genuine creativity (their pseudonyms are telling).	Guests are sinners: murderers, traitors, poisoners etc. also kings, dukes, knights etc.
'Hell' whose guests are alive in the physical sense and dead in the spiritual sense.	'Hell' whose guests are dead in the physical sense and alive as spirits.

The correspondence outlined above may also be presented through the following oppositional pattern of the material and fictitious planes:

<u>Material plane:</u>	<u>Fictitious parallel:</u>
- physically alive;	- physically dead;
- spiritually dead;	- alive as spirits;
- Moscow locations:	- the 'fifth dimension':
1) flat No. 50;	1) Satan's residence;
2) the Griboyedov party.	2) Satan's Ball.

This thesis will now attempt to show what thematic significance is contained in this oppositional pattern.

Bulgakov's parallel depictions of the Griboyedov party and Satan's Ball suggest that he considers the act of offending against genuine creativity comparable to the kinds of heinous crime committed by Woland's guests during their life-times. Such names as Pavianov, Bogokhulsky, Sladky etc., given by Bulgakov to the leading MASSOLIT

members, imply the types of vulgarity by which these writers' works are characterised. Bulgakov shows that the MASSOLIT writers have sold their souls to the devil (who is symbolised in this particular instance by the restaurant manager) in exchange for material comfort. In a sense these authors are seen by Bulgakov as murderers: they have voluntarily taken part in the strangling of the spirit of true creativity which inspires the highest aspirations of human life. Thus in the Griboyedov episode Bulgakov depicts 'so-called' authors who are sinning against the spiritual nature and life of man.

The array of guests presented at Satan's Ball is reminiscent of the multitude of sinners introduced to Dante as he journeys through the 'Inferno' and the 'Purgatorio'¹⁰. A catalogue of the diverse sinners is presented by Bulgakov as follows:

Ни Гай Кесарь Калигула, ни Мессалина уже не заинтересовали Маргариту, как не заинтересовал ни один из королей, герцогов, кавалеров, самоубийц, отравительниц, висельников и сводниц, тюремщиков и шулеров, палачей, доносчиков, изменников, безумцев, сыщиков, растлителей.
(685)

The crimes of the guests who are specially introduced to Margarita on their arrival merge into a pattern of murder, i.e. of physical killing of fellow human beings. The riotous champagne baths recall the memory of the Dantean sinners writhing in pools of mud and stagnation, and of blood. A reference to the fires burning below - '[Маргарита] летала над стеклянным полом с горящими под ним адскими топками и мечущимися между ними дьявольскими белыми поварами' (688) - reminds the reader of Dante's circles of hell. A possible connection with Faust is evoked through Margarita's memory as she looks at the furnaces blazing below: 'она, ... видела темные подвалы, где горели какие-то светильники, где девушки подавали шипящее на раскаленных углях мясо, где пили из больших кружек за ее здоровье' (688). In Faust the

tavern scenes are renowned for the outrageous celebration of the pleasures of the flesh. Thus Satan's Ball surfeits in everything that makes up the Griboyedov party: music, food, drink and, most important of all, crime. Such a surfeit as is offered here at a Ball which takes place on the non-material dimension of being requires some explanation.

At the Ball Woland is providing his guests with the surfeit of meat and drink because they are symbolic of the flesh and blood of which the dead are deprived. Bulgakov's treatment of the 'fifth dimension' accords with Florensky's understanding of 'fictional parallels' also in the sense that, as asserted by Florensky, on the non-material dimension the material reality and matter do not disappear but their manifestation acquires a new meaning. In this context the new meaning which the meat and drink acquire at the Ball relates to a ritual communion in which the guests thus participate. This unholy communion, with its highest ritualistic point of drinking blood, taken through the devil's agency, enables the evil-doers to re-establish a connection with the material dimension of reality, of life in its physical manifestation in a way which confirms Florensky's affirmation that 'Область мнимостей реальна, [и] постижима'¹¹.

Woland himself undergoes a metamorphosis when he drinks blood newly drained from Baron Meigel's body:

Исчезла заплатанная рубаха и стоптанные туфли. Воланд оказался в какой-то черной хламиде со стальной шпагой на бедре. (691)

Margarita, too, is revitalised through the same drink while the devil explains:

- ... кровь давно ушла в землю. И там, где она пролилась, уже растут виноградные гроздья. (691)

The mystery of the communion is revealed by the devil through this

explanation: the shed blood fattens the grapes which yield the wine for the restoration of the spilt blood, since time itself can stand still, contract or expand on the 'fifth dimension'. By means of 'arguing in a circle' Bulgakov demonstrates in this part of his novel how life and death exist as a continuous negation - and affirmation - of one another. At cock-crow the Ball and its guests disintegrate.

While Satan's Ball surfeits in meat and drink the Griboyedov party indulges to excess in a visionary experience. This experience is conveyed through seductive prose which the following passage illustrates:

И было в полночь видение в аду. Вышел на веранду черноглазый красавец с кинжальной бородой, во фраке и царственным взором окинул свой владения. Говорили, говорили мистики,¹² что было время, когда красавец не носил фрака, а был опоясан широким кожаным поясом, из-за которого торчали рукояти пистолетов, а его волосы воронова крыла были повязаны алым шелком, и плыл в Караибском море под его командой бриг под черным гробовым флагом с адамовой головой. (477)

This passage is characterised by euphony and mysticism which transforms the restaurant manager into a romantic hero who surveys his domain with regal attitude and whose past acquires a legendary dimension. Bulgakov's deep disillusionment with the kind of deception interwoven into the above passage becomes painfully obvious in the next paragraph where he repeatedly denies the validity of the fantastic lie on the maintenance of which the Griboyedov party depends:

Но нет, нет! Лгут обольстители-мистики,¹³ никаких Караибских морей нет на свете, и не плывут в них отчаянные флибустьеры, и не гонится за ними корвет, не стелется над волною пушечный дым. Нет ничего, и ничего и не было! Вон чахлая липа есть, есть чугунная решетка и за ней бульвар ... (477)

In this episode Bulgakov shows how reality is transformed into mystery through the deceptive fantasy in which the 'seducer-mystics' indulge.

In this connection it is important to recall that Satan's Ball culminates at the point at which through the devil's agency mystery becomes transformed into reality. This happens when Woland explains how the cycle of blood-grapes-wine-blood is related to the rite of communion in which Woland partakes at the Ball.

Through the two passages quoted above Bulgakov demonstrates that the dialectic of truth and falsehood exists also in the domain of creative imagination. Bulgakov's angry despair is directed at those writers who seek to 'seduce' their public with 'mysticism' which does not in any way relate to reality or to the truth about the human existence. The legendary buccaneer of the Griboyedov party and his romantic past are paralleled here with the kinds of heroes and legends which were being created in Socialist realist literature. In his novel Bulgakov employs fantasy to bring reality into a sharper focus of attention, to illuminate its true nature. But the Socialist realist writers employ fantasy to embellish reality so that the public's understanding of the political and social truth about their reality and also of the truth about the nature of human beings is severely impaired. It is inevitable that since Socialist realist literature is an essential part of the reality which is depicted in Master i Margarita Bulgakov cannot allow it to escape his scrutiny. In order to illustrate the lack of credibility of conformist literature Bulgakov simply injects his writing with an overdose of the artfulness which is characteristic of the deception in which the 'seducer-mystics' indulge. Thus the Griboyedov 'hell' with its midnight apparition of a romantic hero represents a false reality whose false hero is a pretender-devil. This forms the fantastic lie which at once both sustains the Socialist realist writers in Moscow and is itself sustained by the hack-literati.

2.3 Reality and fantasy of legends

It is interesting to note here that the author of The Life of Jesus, E. Renan, whose work interested Bulgakov greatly and to whom repeated reference will be made in the next chapter, remarks in the introduction to his work that legends do not all have the same value¹⁴. He cites as an example the legend about Francis d'Assisi and observes that no one doubts the main features of this saint's life although they are steeped in the supernatural. On the other hand, few would accept the credibility of the Life of Apollonius of Tyana since this was written long after the hero's life-time and it was written as a romance. Familiarity with either of these legends is irrelevant to this thesis. The importance of these examples is revealed in the way in which they reflect the distinction between true and false legends.

Renan indicates that the credibility of legends must be determined according to when they were written, by whom, and under what circumstances. The visionary legend conjured up amongst the 'seducer-mystics' at the Griboyedov party undoubtedly fails such a test of credibility. Similarly, Bulgakov seems to suggest, the legends created by Socialist realist writers about the future of their society must be read as 'romances'. This is because through the hack-writers' agency reality is shrouded in a quasi-romantic haze which disintegrates as it comes into contact with the truth. The truth is contained in the harsh reality perception of which causes the narrator to call for poison¹⁵:

- О боги, боги мои, яду мне, яду! .. (477)

A further opposition of reality and fiction/fantasy is presented by Bulgakov through the Pontius Pilate story in the episode which is concerned with the authenticity of Matthew the Levite's recording of Jeshua's words. The discussion of Matthew's legend is based on the

general premise that while the romantic account of the midnight vision at the Griboyedov party represents fiction in its most deceptive aspect, the Pontius Pilate story emerges as a product of genuine literary creativity, that is, as a work of a Master. This premise presupposes that, unlike the portrayal of the false devil at the party, the Pontius Pilate story reflects reality in a way which focuses attention on and illuminates the truth about the human condition. The final section of this thesis attempts to defend this presupposition. In the meantime, a more detailed exploration of the episode in the Pontius Pilate story which is directly concerned with true and false literature is conducted here.

The aim is to establish whether the legend which is being created by Matthew the Levite in the Pontius Pilate story forms a 'fictitious parallel' corresponding to reality in a true and meaningful manner. From Jeshua's point of view Matthew's creative activities result in a serious distortion of the truth; Jeshua remarks:

- ... ходит, ходит один с козлиным пергаментом и непрерывно пишет. Но я однажды заглянул в этот пергамент и ужаснулся. Решительно ничего из того, что там записано, я не говорил. Я его умолял: сожги ты бога ради свой пергамент! Но он вырвал его у меня из рук и убежал.
(439)

If Jeshua himself rejects Matthew's testimony by rendering it invalid because it does not accord with what happens in reality it seems justifiable to assume that Bulgakov intends to discredit this disciple's notes. However, at the end of the novel Bulgakov endows Matthew with a place in the Kingdom of Light where the disciple acts as Jeshua's emissary. Some reference to Renan's understanding of the Gospel truth aids the discovery of Bulgakov's true intent in Matthew's case which otherwise appears to be quite contradictory¹⁶.

Renan defends the legend of Jesus by pointing out that the

evangelists themselves were so much inferior to Jesus that they could not help distorting his image. This means that since the evangelists could not attain Jesus' stature they had to cut it down so that it remained within their reach. Often they made errors when they were required to describe things of which they themselves had no conception. This is why their attempt to embellish Jesus' image frequently ended up by diminishing it. In accordance with Renan's interpretation Bulgakov presents Matthew the Levite in his novel as a character who is imbued with human flaws and whose testimony concerning Jeshua's ideas is rendered questionable because of the disciple's very humanity. It can even be argued that in the Pontius Pilate story Matthew's ignorant recording of Jeshua's ideas serves to incriminate the vagrant: while being questioned by Pilate Jeshua appears to understand suddenly that the accusations directed against him have been at least partly taken from Matthew's parchment (440).

Matthew the Levite is a tax-collector who has given up all his worldly possessions in order to follow Jeshua. Matthew emerges from the novel as a single-minded character in whose case conversion to being a disciple is tantamount to the replacement of one uni-dimensional outlook by another. The materialistic outlook which pertains to a tax-collector's profession is replaced in Matthew's case by a total commitment to the ideas advocated by Jeshua. This single-mindedness is severely criticised by the devil in a later episode where Woland seeks to widen the disciple's vision by explaining to him the respective significance of Light and Shadow to the living earth and thus urging him not to ignore evil but to acknowledge its importance in relation to good (776). In his novel Bulgakov ascribes to Matthew an outlook which is absolute and dogmatic and which lacks any understanding of the paradox contained in the truth manifest in Jeshua's mission.

Matthew's frailty is further illustrated through his cursing of God at a moment of despair (585).

This is the man who has taken upon himself the task of recording Jeshua's words. These words contain ideas which are wholly superior to Matthew's inadequate understanding and perception of them. The discrepancy which necessarily exists between the intent of Jeshua's words and Matthew's understanding of them causes Jeshua to condemn the disciple's record as false. Thus it can be argued that Matthew's writing serves to diminish Jeshua's image in the manner explained by Renan. On the other hand, Matthew must be seen as pursuing the cause of truth in the sense that he is performing his task to the best of his ability. This earns him access to the Kingdom of Light. There, too, Matthew is engaged to deliver Jeshua's words: he acts as Jeshua's messenger and an intermediary between his Kingdom and its peripheral twilight zones.

The legend which ensues from Matthew's interweaving of reality and fiction illuminates the truth about Jeshua as understood by this disciple. In comparison with the mercenary MASSOLIT writers, Matthew the Levite, in spite of his shortcomings, emerges as a sincere deliverer of truth in the novel. Only the following fragmentary pieces of Matthew's writing appear in the work:

"Смерти нет ... Вчера мы ели сладкие весенние баккуроты ..."

"Мы увидим чистую реку воды жизни ... Человечество будет смотреть на солнце сквозь прозрачный кристалл ..."

" ... большего порока ... трусость". (744-5)

These disjointed statements, even if they distort Jeshua's actual words, relate to the way in which the vagrant philosopher understands reality in the Pontius Pilate story. In the confines of this reality the philosophical truth is interwoven into the fabric of everyday

existence in such a manner that the metaphysical aspects of human existence acquire tangible significance. According to Renan, Jesus considered matter only as a sign of the idea which does not appear as such in material reality¹⁷. It is clear that Matthew the Levite, like Pilate, can perceive only a vague outline of Jeshua's teachings. Yet, this perception creates sufficient ground for the seed of faith to take root and develop so that in the final analysis it is Matthew's total devotion to and faith in his Master which lends credibility to his testimony. Unlike Griboyedov literati, Matthew is writing for no material gain; he is writing because it is his heart's desire to do so. The fragments of his work which appear in the novel are pregnant with philosophical meaning, and the ideas contained in these fragments are as much part of reality as the early spring figs, the recollection of which is recorded by Matthew in the text of the parchment.

In conclusion, if Matthew the Levite's testimony is measured against the questions by which Renan proposes to determine the credibility of legends¹⁸ the disciple's fragmentary recording of Jeshua's words can be seen paralleling reality in a fictitious, but nevertheless true and meaningful manner. Jeshua abides by the truth which makes the material reality transparent. That is, he raises his sight towards the metaphysical dimension of existence and describes it in terms which are inextricably bound with the material reality of Jerusalem (temple, kingdom, power etc.). In this way Jeshua aids the revelation of the mystery which necessarily defines man's attitude to the intangible aspects of existence. It is conceivable then that Jeshua should protest against Matthew's presentation of his words in a manner which reinforces the mystery rather than aids its revelation.

Yet, despite errors and misunderstandings which undermine Matthew's account of Jeshua's words, the legend originating from this

account serves to aid the revelation of the God-image in man, even if it wilfully ignores the paradoxical nature inherent in this image. In Master i Margarita the devil's axiom that everyone receives according to his belief is shown to be true also in Matthew's case: the disciple is endowed with the right to enter the Kingdom of Light from where he continues to deliver Jeshua's words while still remaining ignorant of the paradox of good and evil.

2.4 Life on earth from the devil's viewpoint

The exploration of the 'fifth dimension' thus far shows that in Bulgakov's novel this non-material level of existence is connected with the revelation of man-made mysteries or legends. On the 'fifth dimension' the material reality becomes transparent so that illusions which sustain these mysteries are shown in their true aspect. Human gullibility is further revealed by Bulgakov in the episode which depicts life on earth as a chess-game (673) and which presents Margarita observing an illuminated globe seething with life (675). This globe enables the viewer to see vividly events occurring in any particular place at the time of observation. The Hoffmannesque device of a diminished scale of presentation is employed here to illustrate the madness and insignificance of the power games in which men are constantly engaged on earth and which they commonly consider to be of the utmost significance to mankind.

On the chessboard the king scuttles away at the instigation of the villainous cat who tries to gain advantage in the game by referring to the rule of logic which arises from a false premise in the first place. The devil impatiently defies the cat's argument and insists on the truth of the matter:

- Мессир! Я вновь обращаюсь к логике, - заговорил кот, прижимая лапы к груди, - если игрок объявляет шах королю, а

короля между тем уже и в помине нет на доске, шах признается недействительным.

- Ты сдаешься или нет? - прокричал страшным голосом Воланд.

- ... Сдаюсь. (673)

Men whom the live chess pieces represent here emerge from this power game as mere pawns. These pawns may be employed by irresponsible players for the purpose of playing pranks upon one another. However, the devil's insistence on responsible play serves to effect some order in the chaotic circumstances which dominate the game.

From the power game Margarita's attention focuses on the globe, in particular on a certain strip of land where a war has just broken out. The brutal killing brings no victory to either side but it causes the violent death of a young, innocent child who is left lying in a pool of blood. The image of the child with the grieving mother at his side speaks of the wasteful, senseless sacrifice. Through this image Bulgakov illustrates how on a personal level wars inevitably result, not in gains, but in losses which carry in their wake deep sorrow and pain. On a more general level, the devil explains, the outcome is always the same: neither of the fighting sides ever comes out better than the other. Abaddonna, the master of destruction¹⁹, who commands the activities on the battle-field, ensures this; Woland explains:

- ... Он на редкость беспристрастен и равно сочувствует обеим сражающимся сторонам. Вследствие этого и результаты для обеих сторон бывают всегда одинаковы. (675)

Thus the raison d'être of wars, as understood by men, is refuted utterly by the devil through the introduction of Abaddonna as a leveller on the battle-field.

Both the chess-game and the live globe episodes reflect an outlook on life commonly attributed to the culture of the Age of Antiquity when pagan gods were seen as wielding a capricious influence on men's lives.

Bulgakov's examples demonstrate that modern men in their arrogance see themselves as designing and controlling their own destinies and also, in a larger context, the destinies of their nations and of all nations of the world. Yet, men are seriously deceived in this view since, as Bulgakov shows, the forces which play with and keep surveillance on these destinies are beyond the unsuspecting men's control.

Bulgakov, like E. T. A. Hoffmann, depicts the order which men conceive as defining their life on earth as illusory and arbitrary²⁰. In Master i Margarita life is seen in its true perspective from the devil's point of view, from the 'fifth dimension'. Hoffmann, too, viewed life from the point of view of a transcendental world in which his spirit felt at home and from which life on the material plane of existence could be observed in all its fantastic manifestations. Hoffmann saw strange images and figures, reminiscent of Chinese shadows, which considered themselves as the rulers of the earth. None of these rulers realised that each of them had a devil sitting under his seat and at any moment the devil might play a joke on him. Both Bulgakov and Hoffmann see people acting like marionettes which move at the guidance of the manipulator's hand on the scene set for tragedy in the puppet theatre of life. In this way both authors belittle and mock mercilessly the greatness with which mankind believes itself to be endowed. Hoffmann's observations led him to enquire whether a poet could possibly acknowledge the reality of the tangible world. This enquiry reveals the extent of Hoffmann's disillusionment. In Bulgakov's novel the Moscow citizens' willingness to suspend belief in life's true mysteries and to sustain it in the man-made ones shows that, like Hoffmann, Bulgakov had become deeply disillusioned with the world of material reality.

In the first part of Master i Margarita the mysteries and magic are seen mostly from the citizens' point of view, that is, as the victims' experience of supernatural forces. In the second part of the novel the devil resides in his own domain on the 'fifth dimension' where the shroud of mystery is removed, since the devil is presented in support of a common sense attitude towards life and death. The adventures of Woland's assistants in Moscow are depicted from their viewpoint and this leaves no doubt about the fact that the mission of the devil's crew in Moscow consists of the revelation of the truth which underlies the false mysteries and myths created to support the status quo in Moscow. As an irreverent example of this mission it is helpful to recall Behemoth's performance in the shop which is filled with delicacies. The cat delivers a heart-rending speech which, despite the grotesque and over-blown emotion expressed in it, is received sympathetically by the majority of the customers. The speech attacks a privileged alleged foreigner, who at the moment of despair turns out to be a genuine Russian citizen, whose pockets are bulging with foreign currency. Behemoth's public exposé of the villain's true colours gives rise to a 'miracle':

Приличнейший тихий старичок, одетый бедно, но чистенько, старичок, ... вдруг преобразился. ... он ... крикнул:

- Правда! - детским тонким голосом. (766)

The miracle consists of the revelation and recognition of the truth which Bulgakov seeks to expose in Master i Margarita.

3. The heroine

3.1 Margarita's spiritual quality

In Master i Margarita the Moscow character who feels most at home on the devil's dimension is, of course, Margarita. She is

introduced into the novel first through the Master's memory of her as she was during the Master's life-time in Moscow. At the beginning of the second part of the novel she is reintroduced by the author. The reintroduction follows a celebration of true love composed in a style which is mockingly reminiscent of the Gogolian hyperbole (632). After the lovers have been reunited at Margarita's instigation, she inspires the Master to place his faith in the devil. The Master agrees finally:

- ... Конечно, когда люди совершенно ограблены, как мы с тобой, они ищут спасения у потусторонней силы! Ну, что ж, согласен искать там. (782)

At the end of the novel Margarita shares the Master's destiny thus sought and found by both of these characters in the 'other world'. At this point it is necessary to examine why Margarita is so well suited to become a witch and to play the devil's Queen. Some reference will also be made to the affinity which she bears to witches as described in the folk tradition.

It must be noted that Margarita, too, is a divided character in Bulgakov's novel. This division is manifest in the separate lives she leads simultaneously with a respectable husband and a clandestine lover. The split of Margarita's personality between her public and private lives is symptomatic of the conflict between art and life in the sense that her married life consists simply of keeping up appearances, while in the course of the clandestine love affair she comes to be identified with the Master's creative issue itself. It is thus inevitable that the fate of the Master and his creation - oblivion - should be shared by Margarita.

Margarita Nikolayevna, the Master's beloved, is beautiful, clever, wealthy and married to another man. She is unhappy, because she needs

her beloved Master more than anything she has got. Margarita is a typical well-off wife from the privileged Soviet class: she does not love her husband and her life is filled with ease and boredom. The Master's earlier account of her, given to Ivan Bezdomny, reveals that she can also create an aura of comfortable domesticity which defines the atmosphere in the Master's basement flat during the hours the lovers spend there together. Margarita is, however, distinguished from others of her kind by virtue of a spiritual quality which she possesses and which heralds her unusual destiny already in the Master's recollection of her in the asylum and, particularly, in the introductory chapter which opens the second part of the novel (632). In this chapter Margarita is shown to be inspired in three different ways to undermine the constraints of the material reality in which she resides:

- 1) she has a prophetic dream about the lifeless hell where she sees her lover (632);
- 2) she says to her maid jokingly that she also wants to do a magic trick in imitation of the wonders performed at the Variety Theatre and then gives her maid a pair of stockings and some scent (636);
- 3) she conducts an imaginary conversation with the Master on a Moscow park bench in full day-light (637-8).

Margarita reasons out the prophecy of the dream as follows:

"Сон этот может означать только одно из двух, ... если он [Мастер] мертв и поманил меня, то это значит, что он приходил за мною, и я скоро умру. ... Или он жив, тогда сон может означать только одно, что он напоминает мне о себе! Он хочет сказать, что мы еще увидимся." (634-5)

She is convinced that she will be soon rejoining her lover. Marga-

rita's wish to do a magic trick, which is not magic at all but a wish fulfilment of the maid (as at the Variety Theatre), is the most trivial and the least likely way of breaking out of the material reality, but, ironically, magic comes to offer the means by which Margarita is released. The imaginary conversation consists of questions and answers painfully familiar to such individuals as those whose destinies have been violently severed by a long sentence in a labour camp or a prison:

"Если ты сослан, то почему же ты не даешь знать о себе? Ведь дают же люди знать. Ты разлюбил меня? Нет, я почему-то этому не верю. Значит, ты был сослан и умер ... Тогда, прошу тебя, отпусти меня, дай мне наконец свободу жить, дышать воздухом". Маргарита ... отвечала себе за него: "Ты свободна ... Разве я держу тебя?" Потом возражала ему: "Нет, что же это за ответ! Нет, ты уйди из моей памяти, тогда я стану свободна". (637-8)

The spiritual quality which Margarita possesses has enabled her to escape temporarily from the confines of the material reality of Moscow into the life of the Master and his novel.

The rejection of the novel by the censors and the Master's disappearance mark the end of the period of artistic creation whose very life pulsed with Margarita's heart-beat. The end of creativity brings about the death of the artist and of the life which Margarita had in the Master's novel, although the memory of the active creativity remains with both of them. Both the Master and Margarita are now captives of their memory of the past life - life which relates to artistic creation - and freedom from this captivity may be gained only through the obliteration of the memory. The Master has resigned himself to living out his physical life in the asylum, while Margarita reaches out and calls for the devil's help.

With instinctive intelligence Margarita knows herself to be possessed by the Master - ' ... говорила Маргарита тому, кто владел ею, ...' (638). The consequences of such 'possession' are revealed

in Margarita's anguished question:

"Почему я исключена из жизни?" (638)

Margarita's relationship with the Master and her affinity with the Master's creation have excluded her from life and in the rest of the novel Margarita is depicted at different stages of a journey which will reunite her with the Master and his creation for eternity, even if the destination be the limbo of oblivion.

In the course of the novel the Master and Margarita experience death three times:

- 1) The end of the Master's artistic creativity which culminates in the lovers being separated from one another marks the death of the artist - the Master refers to his work and says: " ... я вышел в жизнь, держа его в руках, и тогда моя жизнь кончилась, ..." (558) - and also the death of Margarita in the sense that she had existed in the Master's creation: ' ... в этом романе ее жизнь ' (558).
- 2) The Master and Margarita are poisoned by the ancient wine brought to them by the devil's emissary.
- 3) Finally they die a physical death. The Master dies in the hospital; the nurse reports to Ivan Bezdomny: "Скончался сосед ваш сейчас, ..." (791). Margarita dies elsewhere in the city; Ivan assures the nurse: " ... сейчас в городе еще скончался один человек. ... это женщина." (791)

The second and third deaths occur simultaneously: Azazello rushes out to Margarita's flat and observes how

... женщина вышла из своей спальни, внезапно побледнела, схватилась за сердце и, крикнув беспомощно:

- Наташа! Кто-нибудь ... ко мне! - упала на пол в гостиной, не дойдя до кабинета.

- Все в порядке, - сказал Азазелло. (785-6)

It can be argued that a fourth death occurs when the Master and Margarita arrive at their destination and when Margarita declares herself the guardian of the Master's sleep which begins to wash away his memory by flooding it with oblivion. Thus a number of deaths occur on different levels of existence which relate to the protagonists' artistic, metaphysical, physical and ethical lives.

But through Bulgakov's artistry the Master and Margarita - paradoxically - survive all the deaths to which they are subjected by the author. This survival is made possible primarily through the narrative twist in the course of which Margarita makes a pact with the devil.

3.2 Margarita and the love story

Bulgakov asserts Margarita's affinity with the devil and his dimension in many ways. He shows how Margarita makes her pact with the devil without a moment's hesitation and fearless of the consequences. Once she has been transformed into a witch she feels free and happy. She performs admirably her demanding duties as the Queen at Satan's Ball. Natural ease defines Margarita's behaviour on the 'fifth dimension'. Fearless openmindedness towards the unknown, the world of death, makes her the ideal candidate for the devil's employment. The devil's assistants explain to her that she is, in fact, distantly related to some French royalty and the matter of blood is of prime importance in the choice of the Queen. The arch Romantic Alexandre Dumas celebrated the historical personage of Marguerite de Valois in the first of his Valois Romances which is entitled La Reine Margot²¹. It has been argued that some of Dumas' finest historical

portraits are found in this work and that they have left an indelible mark on many historians' understanding of these persons. The eponymous heroine of Bulgakov's work may well be 'distantly related' to Marguerite de Valois by Alexandre Dumas, but further illumination for Margarita's character is more aptly derived from Hoffmann's understanding and portrayal of Romantic love and heroines²². However, although it can be claimed that both Dumas' and Hoffmann's Romantic works may provide some important clues for the analysis of Margarita's heroic qualities, the light in which Bulgakov presents his heroine dispels the aura of pure Romanticism and reveals a vision of phantasmagoria from which Margarita emerges as a superhuman being, a demi-goddess of destruction and creation.

In Bulgakov's novel the Master and Margarita become lovers; furthermore, Margarita falls in love with the Master's creation to such an extent that it acquires her heart-beat: '... в этом романе ее жизнь' (558). Bulgakov, like Hoffmann, sees love and art as being inextricably connected with one another. In Hoffmann's work Die Doppelgänger²³ an artist who is in love describes his beloved as an ideal ('not of this world') who aids the artist, his creations and herself to live and breathe through love as one being. Furthermore, just like Hoffmann believes that love, as it affects an artist, serves to ignite the creative impulse and acts as a magic opening into secret worlds, Bulgakov, too, shows affinity with the Romantic understanding of love's potentialities. In his work love, and also the memory of love, ignite the creative impulse and open up new worlds. Ironically, however, in Master i Margarita the love story becomes a parody of a Romantic story; while the Master and Margarita journey towards the world of death the Romantic lovers generally come to experience life in its loftiest manifestations.

Just as true Romantic love is 'not of this world', in Bulgakov's novel the lovers become estranged from the material reality. At first their existence becomes interwoven in the Master's novel and, subsequently, at Margarita's initiative they are winged onto the devil's dimension. With the Romantics the other-worldliness is filled with the promise of new life and creation. In Bulgakov's novel Margarita inspires the Master in a more mundane way; at the beginning of the relationship she creates an atmosphere of cosy domesticity in the Master's flat and, later, as a witch she 'awakens' and 'revives' her lover in a manner which is far less elusive or visionary than the inspiration envisaged by the Romantics. Furthermore, instead of life and creation Margarita leads her beloved towards an existence which is defined by sleep and oblivion. Thus Margarita's effect on the Master is quite the reverse of the effect wielded by the artist's beloved in accordance with the tenets of the Romantic credo. Both Bulgakov and Hoffmann guide their protagonists in the direction of the stars, but, ironically, the Master and Margarita find their destination in a limbo while the Romantic lovers aspire towards higher levels of existence, towards life's heavenly spheres.

The Master's entry into the asylum marks the irrevocable death of the artist in him. In other words, both the Pontius Pilate story and Margarita have been severed from his life. However, both the Master and Margarita carry in themselves the memory of their love which is inextricably connected with the creation of the Master's novel. It has already been pointed out that Margarita feels possessed by this memory (638). This is not surprising since her life is in the novel which has caused the death of her beloved Master - as the Master himself confesses to Ivan:

- ... Я вышел в жизнь, держа его в руках, и тогда
моя жизнь кончилась, ... (558)

This refers, of course, to the ending of the Master's life as a creative artist. Both the Master and his art can be seen as inherent parts of Margarita's being. Consequently, the memory of love which possesses her now ignites an impulse comparable to creativity which delivers her onto the 'fifth dimension'. Thus according to the Romantics' credo, love serves to provide an opening into the secret world - only in Bulgakov's case it is the world of the devil - where things are seen in their true light. The insight which is gained on the devil's dimension is not, however, concerned with the essence of mysticism as was the case with the Romantics but is related to the revelation of the mystery in whose illusory shadow people living in the world of material reality are shown to seek cover from the truth. Moreover, this dimension is closely connected with death. The outlines of the ironic parody of Romantic love emerge from Bulgakov's presentation of the love story in his novel more clearly when the other-worldliness of Romantic love is compared with the Master's and Margarita's reunion on the 'fifth dimension'.

The way in which the 'fifth dimension' in Bulgakov's novel relates to the material reality of existence has been previously illustrated with reference to P. Florensky's ideas on fictitious parallels²⁴. Parallels with Hoffmann's understanding of this relation, i.e. between the material reality and metaphysical aspects of being²⁵, provide some further illumination on the cosmology of Bulgakov's work. Unlike most Romantics, Hoffmann believes that the material and metaphysical realities do not exist separately from one another but they belong to one unified form of existence. Hoffmann envisages a heavenly ladder which rests upon a solid foundation of the material reality and which

leads towards the intangible realm of miracles. When an individual has climbed to the upper reaches of this ladder he is able to experience the miraculous world as part of his mundane life, in fact, as the most marvellous manifestation of that life. Margarita's arrival at flat No. 50 parallels closely the way in which Hoffmann sees men reaching out to touch the metaphysical aspects of being: Margarita, too, sees the endless staircase ahead and ascends it on to the 'fifth dimension'. Like Hoffmann, Bulgakov depicts the material reality and metaphysical levels of being as inextricably bound into one unity of existence. The 'fifth dimension' has its roots in reality which it transcends through fantasy, through the author's imagination. In connection with Hoffmann, dreams are mentioned as an important means of establishing contact with the metaphysical dimension of existence²⁶ since in dreams the spirit is liberated from the body and it is possible to see further when vision is not limited by any physical qualifications. Dreams occur constantly in Master i Margarita.

In the course of the examination of the devil's role in Master i Margarita it was deduced that dreaming (be it in a state of sleep or wakefulness) could explain how the characters were compelled to acknowledge the existence of the irrational, metaphysical dimension of being²⁷. In fact, it is openly stated in the novel that Ivan Bezdomny thinks that he may have dreamt the whole episode concerning the meeting with the devil and also the first section of the Pontius Pilate story while sitting on a park bench. Bulgakov makes clear that the second section of the Master's story is dreamt by Ivan in the asylum. Similarly, Margarita's first contact with the devil - through Azazello - takes place while she is sitting on a park bench and conducting an

imaginary conversation with her lover. That is, she is day-dreaming about a possible reunion with the Master²⁸. This day-dream itself ensues from a dream which Margarita has had the previous night; in the dream the Master has been shown in a hell-like place. Margarita's day-dream on a park bench marks the beginning of the process in the course of which her spirit begins to separate from her body; of course, her spirit is truly liberated only when her body loses its gravity as a result of the application of Azazello's magic cream. Thus Margarita's imaginary conversation with the Master prefigures her flight of imagination in the course of which she becomes invisible and flies through the air as a witch.

An alternative interpretation may be applied to this episode in the park if Bulgakov's text is analysed simply in terms of the material reality of Moscow. After Margarita and Azazello have discussed Berlioz' funeral Azazello confesses to her that he has, in fact, come to her on business:

- ... А между тем я к вам послан по дельцу.

Маргарита побледнела и отшатнулась.

- С этого прямо и нужно было начинать, - заговорила она, - а не молоть черт знает что про отрезанную голову! Вы меня хотите арестовать? (640-1)

Margarita's distrust of Azazello is further increased by his invitation for her to come and meet a well-known foreigner that evening. Azazello now recites a fragment of the Master's novel and this makes Margarita even more convinced that he has been sent to take her away through the 'magic means' which are at work in Moscow all the time:

- ... про листки еще можно узнать ... проникнуть, подсмотреть ... Наташа подкуплена? да? Но как вы могли узнать мои мысли? - Она страдальчески сморщилась и добавила: - Скажите мне, кто вы такой? Из какого вы учреждения? (641)

It is obvious that Margarita is suspicious of Azazello's credibility as she is quite aware of the way in which the secret police works in Moscow. Azazello's invitation to come and meet a foreigner in itself suggests that he is trying to trap Margarita presumably to come and speak to the police against the Master. This suggestion is amply confirmed by Azazello's familiarity with the Master's work. However, Azazello tries to convince Margarita that the invitation is quite harmless:

- Я приглашаю вас к иностранцу совершенно безопас-
ному. И ни одна душа не будет знать об этом посещении.
(642)

As Azazello finally gives Margarita a rounded jar made of solid gold, Margarita thinks once more that she is being enticed to become involved in something shady which she will bitterly regret afterwards. Yet, it is Azazello's confirmation that the Master is still alive and that she might meet him again which makes her accept the risky adventure. Thus begins Margarita's transformation into a witch and the Queen of Satan's Ball.

It is interesting to note that Bulgakov explains in the epilogue of his novel how both Margarita and her maid have disappeared from Moscow during the disorder which prevailed in the city while the magician and his retinue remained there. In other words, Bulgakov suggests that Margarita and her maid have vanished through magic just like many other Moscow citizens. The true explanation for such disappearances may be, of course, sought through the examination of the activities of the secret police. The episode relating Margarita's experience in the park illustrates the transcendental aspect of Bulgakov's work whose parallel can be found in Hoffmann's creativity. S. Ignatov explains that

... мы наблюдаем у Гоффмана как бы перемещение точки зрения - вместо того, чтобы считать за вымысел, за etwas spuckhaftes мир идеальный, он заставляет нас вместе с ним признать, что истинно реальным будет именно этот идеальный мир, а действительность - вымысел, и филистеры, которых он так хорошо изображал на своих рисунках и карикатурах, - не что иное, как сказочные, может быть, несуществующие образы.²⁹

Ignatov asserts that this transference of viewpoint is very important to Hoffmann as it allows him to exist truly in the ideal world while seeing the material world as unreal, as an object of ridicule whose existence may even be entirely ignored. Like Hoffmann, Bulgakov shifts his viewpoint time and time again in the course of his novel.

The transcendental world, represented by the 'fifth dimension', is conceived by Bulgakov as the more real level of existence in the second half of Master i Margarita. The material reality of Moscow is shown to be inhabited by a tribe of philistines who are laughable in their willing support of the illusions upon which their everyday life rests. The 'fifth dimension' represents the ideal world in Bulgakov's work in the sense that it reflects the truth which underlies the illusions of the philistine world. Furthermore, it provides an escape from the confines of the material reality whose shackles may be forced open through the power of imagination armed with fantasy. In the episode relating to Margarita's visit to the park, Azazello acts as the agent who provides the opening onto the devil's dimension while simultaneously appearing to Margarita in the material reality of Moscow as an emissary from the secret police. Thus from Margarita's point of view the paradox inherent in Azazello's character - a liberator and a jailor - embraces both the intangible (the 'fifth dimension') and the tangible (Moscow) aspects of existence as depicted by Bulgakov in his work. This dual role enables Bulgakov to endow his heroine simultaneously with two possible destinies: on the Moscow level Margarita's arrest and disappearance are effected by the secret police

and on the fictitious level she is transformed into a witch and the Queen of Satan's Ball³⁰.

3.3 Margarita as a witch

Bulgakov's depiction of Margarita as a witch relates closely to the popular tradition concerning witches³¹. Margarita becomes a witch after she offers her soul to the devil in exchange for some knowledge of the Master. It is known that Bulgakov referred frequently to M. A. Orlov's study of folk beliefs when writing his novel and it is appropriate to note here how Orlov describes the devil's relation to witches³²: Orlov explains that not only witches themselves - that is, women who believed themselves to be witches - but also other people believed that witches could fly long distances on broom-sticks etc. The most important destination of these flights was the witches' sabbath. In time this belief became so deeply rooted that the clergy could neither dismiss nor ignore it. Consequently they sought to moderate the belief by assuring everybody that actual flights themselves were impossible and that the alleged flights were in fact flights of imagination comparable to dreams. As a result of this assurance a new interpretation grew up among the people: the theory of illusionary flight was accepted in the sense that it was no longer believed that the actual body of the witch took part in the flight. That is, after the witch rubbed herself with a special cream the devil extracted her soul from her body and the soul then flew to the sabbath.

In Bulgakov's novel Margarita anoints herself with Azazello's cream and her body loses its gravity: '... тело Маргариты потеряло вес.' (646) She becomes overwhelmed with the feeling of freedom: 'Маргарита ощутила себя свободной, свободной от всего.' (646)

Bulgakov relates that shortly after that 'С совершенно облегченной

душой Маргарита прилетела в спальню, ...' (647). Margarita's soul grows lighter because it grows free of her body and also because her conscience is finally liberated from the lies on which the relationship with her husband has rested; she leaves him a note telling the truth. Truly invisible and quite free Margarita flies out shouting: " ... невидима, невидима, ..." (650). After a fantastic flight, which takes her away from the tangible reality of Moscow to the river banks where the witches meet, Margarita arrives at the devil's residence. Bulgakov emphasises how the devil's eyes bore into Margarita's face:

Два глаза уперлись Маргарите в лицо. Правый с золотую искрой на дне, сверлящий любого до дна души, ... (669)

Woland has received Margarita in a manner which is in accordance with Orlov's description of this particular tradition: Margarita's spirit has been liberated from her body - the soul flies to the devil. The devil's eyes bore right to the bottom of her soul.

As a witch Margarita belongs to the world of supernatural phenomena. However, it is possible to argue that her supernatural influence on the Master's life extends from the very beginning of their relationship. At their first meeting in the novel the Master is compelled to follow her although everything connected with this meeting forebodes evil, even death:

- ... Любовь выскочила перед нами, как из-под земли выскакивает убийца в переулке, и поразила нас сразу обоих!

Так поражает молния, так поражает финский нож! (556)

Margarita inspires the Master's creativity in the sense that her own life is contained in this novel (558). Thus creativity and inspiration come together to bring into being the Pontius Pilate story. The Master's and Margarita's union demonstrates that creativity is comparable with love in the way in which it comes to possess the indi-

viduals. When hostile outside forces reject the Pontius Pilate story, the Master's creativity falls into a state of paralysis while Margarita returns temporarily to her former life. Then Margarita offers her soul to the devil in exchange for knowledge of the Master. With devilish powers she effects an illusory recovery of the Master; this leads both protagonists towards death, which brings fulfilment for the Master's desire for peace. Dreamless sleep envelops the Master in the limbo where Margarita leads him and where she will become the guardian of his sleep. Thus in the course of the love story Margarita's inspiration loses its life-enhancing quality as it guides the Master towards oblivion.

Margarita provides hope where any realistic grounds for optimism no longer exist. The monumental force of creativity, identifiable with the elemental force of love, is sustained and sustains Margarita in the hostile environment of Moscow and even enables her to transcend the world of material reality onto the devil's dimension where the regenerative powers inherent in her no longer serve to enhance life but, on the contrary, help to instigate the approach of death.

Throughout the novel the role in which Bulgakov casts Margarita is connected with caring for the Master. After the Master becomes depressed as a result of his work being rejected by the literary establishment Margarita swears to him:

1) - ... я тебя спасу, я тебя спасу. (564)

2) - Я тебя вылечу, вылечу, ... (564)

Later in the novel when they have been reunited Margarita assures the Master that

1) - ... я ручаюсь тебе, ручаюсь, что все будет блестяще-
тельно хорошо. (781)

2) - Клянусь тебе ... клянусь ... все будет хорошо. (782)

In the second instance Margarita's assurances ensue from her observation of what has happened to the Master during his absence from her life:

- ... какие у тебя глаза! В них пустыня ... А плечи,
плечи с бременем ... Исклечили, исклечили, ... (782)

Margarita talks with the Master whose depressed spirit begins to revive as he agrees to look for salvation in the 'other world'. Margarita's love for the Master has made her fearless of becoming involved with the devil; the Master has grown fearless because of what he has experienced after his work was rejected:

- ... не боюсь, потому что я все уже испытал. Меня
слишком пугали и ничем более напугать не могут. (782)

Thus fearless and with faith in the devil the Master and Margarita seek for a resting place in 'another world' and find themselves in a limbo which is suggestive of the highest, the first circle of Dante's hell.

The way in which Bulgakov juxtaposes truth with fantasy illustrates why the Master is endowed with peace, rather than light, at the end of the novel. As a result of openly declaring his faith in truth Jeshua is executed and received into the Kingdom of Light. On the other hand, the Master and Margarita hide their faith in the devil from the outside world (Margarita's servant girl Natasha steals in on the secret and is included in the elect circle) and the devil aids their escape through fantasy. It was argued earlier in this study that the 'fifth dimension' is rooted in reality but sustained by fantasy which must be seen in this novel simply as a further level of existence, as an additional direction of reality³³. In the context of this statement it can now be argued that Margarita's character is employed in the novel to aid the Master/creator to penetrate onto this new dimension where everything is possible, particularly for an individual with some imagination and courage.

To conclude the discussion on Margarita's involvement with the devil it is helpful to refer to C. G. Jung's warning to 'beware of thinking of good and evil as absolute opposites'³⁴. Jung emphasises that an ethical decision, which he identifies as a subjective, creative act, should arise from a spontaneous impulse³⁵. Thus Margarita's involvement with the devil and her connection with the fantastic dimension of existence do not necessarily make her evil. Rather, her behaviour may be seen simply as a continued expression of the spontaneous impulse through which she came to participate in the Master's creative act. This act itself, the creation of the Pontius Pilate story, represents the essence of the ethical decision upon which Bulgakov's creative life depended. In Bulgakov's novel Margarita's character emerges as the most outstanding advocate of Jung's advice which states that 'we must have the freedom in some circumstances to avoid the known moral good and do what is considered to be evil, if our ethical decision so requires'³⁶. Thus in the novel Margarita turns to the devil in order to do what she instinctively knows to be right. The 'known moral good' in her case demands her to suppress the memory of the Master and his novel and to continue living a lie with the man whom she does not love. By calling for the devil's help Margarita, then, exercises the kind of freedom to which Jung refers in the above statement.

CHAPTER SIX:
The Pontius Pilate story

1. Introduction

The Pontius Pilate story contains the philosophical kernel of Bulgakov's novel. Accordingly, this thesis attempts to show that the characters of Pontius Pilate and Jeshua are employed by Bulgakov in the story to reflect the paradox which underlies the author's philosophical preoccupations in Master i Margarita¹. The first section of the Master's novel, 'Pontiy Pilat' (435), is studied here in detail, since the Procurator's questioning of Jeshua and its immediate aftermath illustrate most clearly the dilemma which emerges from these two protagonists' shared predicament in Jerusalem. The choice of Pontius Pilate and Jeshua as the protagonists of the Master's novel is understandable as they are familiar to us from the New Testament. Bulgakov gives his own interpretation of these biblical characters, and also of the events surrounding the crucifixion, and this interpretation reveals the conventional moral absolutes of good and evil in a new light. During Pilate's questioning of Jeshua the two protagonists become irretrievably bound up with one another for eternity and this reflects the paradox which characterises the novel's philosophical outlook: awareness of evil relativizes good, and vice versa, so that in the final analysis the ethical polarities come to be seen as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'². The greatest and most reverberating paradox of all is manifest in the joint immortality which Pilate's and Jeshua's reunion at the end of the work reaffirms.

The Pontius Pilate story is presented in three sections in the novel, apart from the Procurator's final appearance in the chapters which bring the different strands of the novel to a harmonious denouement. The story opens as the devil's eye-witness account of the events in Jerusalem relating to the New Testament story of the Roman Procurator's questioning of Christ which culminates in Pilate confirming

the death sentence on him. When Berlioz declares that he is sceptical of Woland's account, as nobody could confirm that these events really took place, the devil defies this scepticism by asserting that:

- Дело в том ... что я лично присутствовал при всем этом. И на балконе был у Понтия Пилата, и в саду, когда он с Канфой разговаривал, и на помосте, но только тайно, инкогнито, так сказать, ... (460)

At the conclusion of the first section Ivan Bezdomny wonders whether, in fact, he has dreamt the whole episode while snoozing on a Moscow park bench in the heat of a dying May afternoon. The second section, which unfolds the events of the execution and its immediate aftermath, is dreamt by Ivan in the mental asylum. The dream occurs in sleep induced by a sedative and it happens after Ivan has met with the Master, i.e. after his personality has split. The third section, which narrates the Procurator's dealings in the matter of Judas of Karioth and also the funeral, is read by Margarita in the restored manuscript during the night after she has recovered the Master and when she is acting as the guardian of the Master's sleep for the first time. Pilate's last appearances in the novel as a whole are related by the author, i.e. Bulgakov, who assumes the right to direct the events on the unearthly dimension on which the final aesthetic harmony is effected.

2. Man versus power

The Procurator's presence dominates the beginning of the Pontius Pilate story. He is a representative of the Roman Empire which was a state in the full meaning of the word. Rome was the centre of this state and it provided the empire with laws, magistrates, a defence force, prefects and even gods. On the other hand, the whole life of

the empire flowed back towards Rome - first to the senate and then to the Caesar who acted as the omnipotent, omniscient god of the empire³. Thus the example of Rome provides a highly suitable contrast to the kind of anarchism which emerges from Jeshua's ideas in the Pontius Pilate story. Before turning to a detailed examination of the dilemma of leadership and the effect of power as reflected in the individual case of the Roman Procurator in Jerusalem it is useful to refer briefly to the relationship of man versus power as understood in general by thinkers through the ages and then as outlined by N. Berdyaev with particular reference to the idea of power as it emerged from the Slavophile thought in Russia⁴.

Throughout the ages man has been fascinated by the concept of a society without authority. Although the political philosophy of the ancients was founded on the idea that the quest for justice and good are inseparable from the existence of the state, a reaction developed against this fundamental principle. The case of a monk called Essenes may be regarded as one of the earliest examples of a revolt against the state: this monk retreated from Jerusalem to escape the rigid authority of Rome and also the static institutionalisation of Hebrew monotheism in the first century B.C.⁵. In the Master's novel this rigid authority of Rome is manifest in Pontius Pilate and it is expressed by means of the power that he wields in Jerusalem. It is appropriate that Pilate's relationship to power should be considered with regard to ideas of how power is generally understood to affect man.

One of Plato's dialogues records an Athenian remarking on

man's inability to wield power:

"There is no soul of man, young and irresponsible, who will be able to sustain the temptation of arbitrary power - no one who will not, under such circumstances, become filled with folly, that worst of diseases, and be hated by his nearest and dearest friends: when this happens his kingdom is undermined, and all his power vanishes from him."⁶

However, Plato and other Greek philosophers did not regard all exercise of power as corrupting. On the contrary. A distinguished Western philosopher advocates the opposite view as follows:

"While some men are corrupted by wielding power, others are improved by it, ... The full actualization of humanity would then seem to consist, not in some sort of passive membership in civil society but in the properly directed activity of the statesman, the legislator, or the founder ... The judge and the ruler has larger and nobler opportunities to act justly than the ordinary man ... Politics is the field on which human excellence can show itself in its full growth."⁷

Lord Acton chose to ignore the dilemma of leadership, as defined and ardently debated by the ancient Greeks, when he boldly asserted in a letter written in 1887 that

"Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men ... are always bad men, even when they exercise influence and authority ..."⁸

Later he added:

"Among all the causes which degrade and demoralise man ... power is the most constant and most active."⁹

The Russian understanding of the relationship of man versus power represents a fusion of ideas outlined above in the sense that it renders the authority of the state as evil while endowing the individual who wields this authority with martyrdom.

In a work entitled Russkaya Ideya Berdyaev puts forward an argument derived from the Slavophile philosophy which claims that

Государственная власть есть зло и грязь. ...
 Лучше, чтобы один человек был запачкан властью, чем
 весь народ. Власть не право, а тягота, бремя.
 Никто не имеет права властвовать, но есть один человек,
 который обязан нести тяжелое бремя власти.¹⁰

Thus power, or authority (as it is generally termed by political scholars in its legitimate manifestation) is not a privilege but an obligation bestowed upon an individual whose mission comprises at once the burden of the sinner and the glory of the saviour. Whilst acknowledging the need for temporal leadership the Slavophile argument implies a clear preference for anarchism. It is important to note that Berdyaev distinguished sharply between anarchism and anarchy¹¹. He considers that anarchism denotes a spiritual order which rises freely from within each individual and which is founded on truth and justice. According to Berdyaev, striving for this kind of anarchism is one of the basic elements in the Russian character. On the other hand, he refers to anarchy and points out that:

За насильническим, деспотическим государством обычно
 скрыта внутренняя анархия и дисгармония.¹²

The anarchist aspect of the Russian character (anarchist as derived from anarchism, i.e. not anarchic) is asserted even in Lenin's writings, especially in his Gosudarstvo i revolyutsiya where the anarchist dimension of Marxism is made far more apparent than in the works of Marx and Engels themselves¹³. The theme of power versus anarchism is of central importance in the Pontius Pilate story in Bulgakov's novel. This theme is studied here in connection with the leadership dilemma as it concerns Pontius

Pilate. In the course of this study an attempt is made to explore to what degree Bulgakov's ideas on this subject accord with the Russian attitude to power as explained by Berdyaev.

A study of the leadership dilemma requires a careful analysis of the ruler's personality and outlook, but it is also important to understand the political climate and the historical reality of the background from which he emerges. In the case of the Pontius Pilate story the historical reporting of unrest lends weight to Bulgakov's fictional narration of the events. The Roman Procurator's office in Jerusalem has been historically verified as a necessary part of the peace-keeping efforts in Judea:

In 6 A.D. Archelaus was accused of mismanaging his ethnarchy which included Samaria, Judea and Idumean. Caesar Augustus tried him and found him guilty and had him banished. His territory became a Roman province with a governor who was called a procurator.¹⁴

Furthermore, it is known that

There were two categories of Imperial governors, corresponding to two categories of provinces. The wealthy and important districts were supervised by governors of senatorial rank who held the title legati propraetore. The minor territories, like the one which included Judea, which required troops to keep order, were governed by men of equestrian rank who were called procuratores.¹⁵

The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia states that Pontius Pilate was the sixth Procurator of Judea and remained in office over a period of approximately ten years (26-36 A.D.). It relates that Pilate did not have his permanent residence in Jerusalem but stayed there only during

important festivals and for the purpose of carrying out his administrative duties in the city. Apparently he was an arrogant and cruel man who felt contempt and hatred towards the Jewish people¹⁶.

It is important to note that the absolute sovereignty over Pilate's dominion rested, of course, with the Roman Emperor Tiberius.

Factually Bulgakov's presentation of Pontius Pilate tallies well with this description.

3. Pontius Pilate

3.1 Pontius Pilate's personality and outlook

The Master's novel opens with an account of Pontius Pilate walking in the colonnade of Herod's palace in Jerusalem in the early morning of the 14th of the Nisan month (435). He is wearing a cloak whose brilliant whiteness is offset by the crimson of the lining. Thus Pilate's paradoxical position is immediately suggested by this juxtaposition of the colour of peace and harmony on the outside and the violence of crimson on the inside. Pilate's shuffling cavalry-man's walk reflects the awkwardness with which he holds the office of an administrator; he would be far more at ease on saddle-back. Pilate's boastful description of himself as 'свиренное чудовище' (437), establishes the ironic contradiction in terms of peace and violence which defines his office in Jerusalem.

The pain of hemicrania, aggravated by the scent of roses and the light of the naked sun, causes Pilate to freeze in physical agony, which curtails his action, perception and understanding to such an extent that he emerges from the marble surroundings of the palace as yet another stony figure amongst the statues. Bulgakov's description of the way in which the pain affects Pilate emphasises repeatedly the Procurator's inability to act freely. Pilate sits down in his chair

'не глядя ни на кого' (436). He glances sideways at the documents given to him by the secretary. He speaks with difficulty. He sits as if made of stone:

Прокуратор при этом сидел как каменный, и только губы его шевелились чуть-чуть при произнесении слов. Прокуратор был как каменный, потому что боялся качнуть пылающей адской болью головой. (436)

Pilate's existence is dominated entirely by his physical condition.

Pilate's questioning of Jeshua Ha-Notsri shows that the Procurator's understanding is also severely impaired. When Jeshua greets him with "Добрый человек!" (436), Pilate automatically hails himself as "свиренное чудовище" (437) thus mechanically asserting the dignity of his office. Then he introduces Mark Muribellum, the centurion, whose physique literally shuts out all the sun-light around him.

Pilate's failure to understand the allegorical significance of Jeshua's claim that the old temple would be destroyed (438) demonstrates further the Procurator's unidimensional view of the world and humanity. To Pilate the destruction of the temple means simply the demolition of the building which houses it; with horror Jeshua claims total ignorance to any such mad intention. Having heard the vagrant's adamant denial of the accusation, Pilate decides that Jeshua is merely a liar, one of the crowd of magicians, astrologers, sooth-sayers and others, who have come to Jerusalem for the celebration of the Passover. Pilate's reaction to the story about Matthew the Levite, a tax-collector, who threw away his money to follow Jeshua, is one of predictable ridicule. After the vagrant has diagnosed and apparently cured Pilate's hemi-crania, the Procurator's curiosity is truly aroused; Jeshua must be a great doctor (442).

All these examples show that Pilate is an incomplete human being in the sense that his understanding lacks any spiritual dimension.

He is a man of purely physical sensibility, who has no metaphysical picture of man. He sees Matthew the Levite's money as the only riches sought after by men. He considers Jeshua a great healer of physical illness, but fails to perceive the signs of a spiritual healer which Jeshua so clearly shows. Pilate's hemicrania, one half of his head aching painfully, is a very concrete indication of his impairment. He is a divided personality; the healthy side of his personality relates to the public, physical and material aspects of life, whilst the aching side encompasses the private and spiritual dimensions of man's existence. The pain itself indicates that it is not possible for a man to live a contented and healthy life if all metaphysical considerations are excluded from his understanding of the human condition. During the questioning Jeshua becomes the catalyst which effects a change in Pilate's condition. Jeshua's companionship aids the partial recovery of the humanity which Pilate has lost.

3.2 Jeshua's influence

It is with the issue of the truth that the vagrant first breaks through the Procurator's indifference. Jeshua's simple answer to Pilate's 'irrelevant' question: "Что такое истина?" (441), takes the Procurator by surprise. The truth is that the Procurator's head is aching. Earlier Jeshua has spoken to the common people through an allegory to make it easier for them to understand his ideas. Now he talks with Pilate on a subject which is, at that moment, of foremost concern to him¹⁷. Jeshua's practical explanation of the truth marks the point in the story at which the roles of the captive and the ruler begin to be reversed. By succeeding in arousing Pilate's astonished interest Jeshua has secured his attention for the more serious part of

his diagnosis:

- Беда в том, ... что ты слишком замкнут и окончательно потерял веру в людей. ... Твоя жизнь скудна, игемон, ... (442)

Pilate orders the vagrant to be untied and from this moment there is hope of liberation for both the captive and the ruler.

Pilate grows almost genial in his conversation with the prisoner, whose free and easy manner and independence of mind intrigue the Procurator. Pilate even allows himself to be drawn into a banter of words which contains an open denial by Jeshua of the Procurator's power over his life. The jocular dialogue ends with Pilate asserting his omnipotence and Jeshua denying it:

- Я могу перерезать этот волосок.

- И в этом ты ошибаешься, - светло улыбаясь и заслоняясь рукой от солнца, возразил арестант, - согласишься, что перерезать волосок уж наверно может лишь тот, кто подвесил?

- Так, так, - улыбнувшись, сказал Пилат, ... (443)

Pilate brushes Jeshua's words aside with laughter and his ironic comment implies that now he understands what kind of a jester he is dealing with. Jeshua's claim that ultimately his life is subject to an authority superior to that commanded by the Procurator could have been seen by Pilate as a grave offence both against his own public office and also against his personal integrity which depends on the delusion that he wields power over the matter of Jeshua's life and death.

Because of his cynicism, his lack of faith in people, the Procurator assigns Jeshua's idealistic creed to books and theory and grows particularly angry when Jeshua assures him that " ... я своим умом дошел до этого" (444). Pilate's experience has taught him otherwise. He has spent most of his life on the battle-field surrounded by the ugliness of violence. The example of the

centurion, Mark Muribellum, fails to impress Jeshua; to him the centurion is not an evil man, rather, he is an unfortunate man whom 'the good people' have mutilated. This argument strikes Pilate as totally senseless, as it is quite outside his experience and understanding of life. However, Pilate has allowed the conversation to move onto a topic which is not directly concerned with the official business. Without noticing it the Procurator is beginning to tolerate the vagrant's idealistic humanism.

Here a small episode takes place which depicts metaphorically how close the possibility of liberation now is for both Jeshua and Pilate:

В это время в колоннаду стремительно влетела ласточка, сделала под золотым потолком круг, снизилась, чуть не задела острым крылом лица медной статуи в нише и скрылась за капителью колонны. (444-5)

The swallow's flight suggests to Pilate a plan for Jeshua's release. It was customary at Passover in Jerusalem for a criminal who had been sentenced to death to be granted freedom. The swallow's flight into the colonnade is symbolic of the freedom, attainment of which seems plausible both for the Procurator and his prisoner at this point of the story. In Jeshua's case this freedom would mean his release from imprisonment and death which threatens him. To Pilate it would mean a break in his private Mediterranean residence from the public office which he holds in Jerusalem and a rediscovery of that private region of humanity which has been suppressed in him in the course of his service. However, the swallow episode ends in a manner which forebodes the failure of the Procurator's plan for Jeshua's release:

Крылья ласточки фыркнули над самой головой игемона, птица метнулась к чаше фонтана и вылетела на волю. (445)

The hope of freedom both for Jeshua and Pilate flies out with the swallow: Pilate reads further the list of accusations concerning

Jeshua's crimes. As Pilate learns more about Jeshua's crimes the hope of shared privacy grows more distant. Contrary to Pilate's wishes, a clash between the hegemon of a highly organised state authority and the advocate of pure anarchism becomes quite unavoidable.

While the Procurator has tolerated the vagrant's comments and even criticism on a personal level, he cannot allow any attack against the state. Although he is attracted to Jeshua's abstract humanism, Pilate cannot for a moment see that such humanism might be applicable to reality. In this context Jeshua's assured prophecy about the coming of the Kingdom of Truth and Justice is tantamount to treason in Pilate's experience.

Until now this study has concentrated on the examination of Pontius Pilate's personality and outlook as depicted by Bulgakov in the story which forms the core of Master i Margarita. Pilate emerges from Bulgakov's depiction as a divided man whose public and personal preoccupations clash with one another. In order to understand this clash more deeply it is necessary to examine this Roman Procurator's attitude towards Jerusalem and his position in the city as presented by Bulgakov in the story and also as revealed in the light of some background information.

3.3 Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem

The origins of Pontius Pilate's name are explained by E. Renan as follows:

Прокуратор Понтий, по прозванию Пилат, - без сомнения, от слова *pilum* или почетный дротик (знак отличия, которого был удостоен он или один из его предков), ...¹⁸

In Master i Margarita Bulgakov refers to Pilate as 'всадник с золотым копьем' (735). It is apparently Pilate's honourable military past which has earned him his position in Jerusalem; he is in charge

of the peace-keeping forces in the city. However, Pilate hates the city and its inhabitants. He resorts to extreme measures of violence to discharge his duties. He is at the centre of the bitter struggle for power in which the Roman and the local authorities are engaged and in which the Jewish High Priest demands his rights in the name of God while Pilate stands by the sword of Caesar. The implacable hostility which existed between the Jews and the Romans can be attributed to the diametrically opposed philosophies governing the lives of these nations, on the one hand, the Jewish theocracy and, on the other, the state as the supreme idea.

Pilate hates Jerusalem whose main building, the temple, conjures up an image of a monstrous dragon in the Procurator's mind:

... перед прокуратором развернулся весь ненавистный ему Ершалаим с висячими мостами, крепостями и - самое главное - с не поддающейся никакому описанию глыбой мрамора с золотой драконовой чешуей вместо крыши - храмом Ершалаимским, ...
(450)

The temple represents to Pilate the power of the Jewish religious hierarchy, whose political manoeuvring is carefully designed to control the Roman influence in the city. Pilate dislikes the Jews, who hate him all the more as they witness the cruel measures undertaken by the Romans under the Procurator's command. According to Renan, the local religious fathers spread a rumour that the Roman Procurator intended to abolish the Jewish law. Their fanaticism and intolerance proved an impossible task for Pilate to curtail and, despite the fact that he had no wish to meddle with any internal religious strife, which he considered to be a result of an inflamed imagination, he got drawn into such incidents as the sentencing of Jeshua¹⁹.

Whenever the Procurator's presence is required in Jerusalem Pilate takes up residence in the former palace of Herod the Great, a ruler

most famous in the Christian world for the slaughter of the innocents. The New Testament relates how Herod failed to slay the child Jesus; Bulgakov's novel tells how, from the same seat of power, Pilate confirms Jeshua's death sentence. King Herod slaughtered as he felt his own and his sons' future threatened by the birth of a ruler whose kingdom and power he did not comprehend. In Bulgakov's work Pilate is terrified by the promise of this same kingdom which he tries to shut out from his mind and also by Tiberius' anger which would ensue from any mention of an alternative to the Emperor's authority. A reference to such an alternative amongst the accusations made against Jeshua conjures up in Pilate's mind a vision of the Emperor's ugly head. Furthermore,

... очень явственно послышался носовой голос, надменно тянувший слова: "Закон об оскорблении величества ..."
(445-6)

Jeshua's most serious offence consists of the following prediction:

- ... всякая власть является насилием над людьми и (что) настанет время, когда не будет власти ни кесарей, ни какой-либо иной власти. Человек перейдет в царство истины и справедливости, где вообще не будет надобна никакая власть. (447)

In Pontius Pilate's experience the kingdom of Caesar is the only order that the Procurator understands and he knows well that this order is both established and maintained through violence and military force. Accordingly, Pilate cannot conceive of such harmony or order as Jeshua foresees arising voluntarily from within human beings. It can be argued that Jeshua advocates the type of anarchism discussed previously and outlined by Berdyaev as follows:

Очень ошибочно отождествлять анархизм с анархией. Анархизм противоположен не порядку, ладу, гармонии, а власти, насилию, царству кесаря. Анархия есть хаос и дисгармония, т. е. уродство. Анархизм есть идеал свободной, изнутри определяемой гармонии и лада, ...²⁰

Jeshua's words frighten Pilate because they contain an open attack against Tiberius' power on which Pilate's life depends.

Furthermore, talking about the kingdom of Caesar Berdyaev states that

За насильническим, деспотическим государством обычно скрыта внутренняя анархия и дисгармония.

Anarchy and disharmony prevail in Jerusalem as a result of the tension which exists between the Romans and the Jews in the city. The seething unrest is mentioned repeatedly in the story. For example, Pilate suspects that 'безумные, утопические речи Га-Ноцри могут быть причиной волнений в Ершалаиме, ... (445) Considering the cases of the offenders sentenced to death Pilate says of the first two: 'Первые двое, вздумавшие подбивать народ на бунт против кесаря, ...' (450). The imminence of unrest is voiced again by the Jewish High Priest:

- ... Не мир, не мир принес нам обольститель народа в Ершалаим, и ты, всадник, это прекрасно понимаешь. Ты хотел его выпустить затем, чтобы он смутил народ, над верою надругался и подвел народ под римские мечи! (454)

In accordance with Berdyaev's statement, 'inward anarchy and disharmony' are clearly apparent 'behind the violence and despotism' in Jerusalem. It is Pilate's duty to preserve the status quo. The hostility which characterises the relationship between Pilate and the local power hierarchy adds to the precariousness of the Procurator's office in the city.

The precariousness of Pilate's position is made even more extreme by the fact that the Roman Emperor himself had given guarantees to the effect that the sanctity of the Jewish religious law would not be violated by the Romans. These guarantees provided the Jewish authorities with the means of manipulating the Roman representative to their own advantage. Pilate's initial reluctance to deal with

Jeshua's case is due to his experience and knowledge of such manipulation. As Renan explains:

... когда религиозный фанатизм успеет склонить гражданские власти к какой-нибудь жестокости, то потом первый будет слагать всю ответственность, почти всю вину, на те же власти. Несправедливость вопиющая; ибо истинный виновник в подобных случаях - подстрекатель!²²

The true measure of Pilate's impotence in the city is revealed in the Jewish High Priest's triumphant assertion that

- ... Услышит нас, услышит всемогущий кесарь, укроет нас от губителя Пилата! (453)

Pilate's and the High Priest's mutual enmity is openly declared in the course of their argument on Jeshua's case. In the High Priest's view Jeshua is a political rabble-rouser and the Procurator's concern for the vagrant's release is simply a matter of political expediency conveniently camouflaged under the guise of Pilate's concern for justice. The Procurator loses the argument and his fate is sealed with the decision which confers Jeshua's crucifixion. As Pilate anticipated before his meeting with the High Priest,

Га-Ноцри уходил навсегда, и страшные, злые боли прокуратора некому излечить; от них нет средства, кроме смерти. (452)

The first part of the Pontius Pilate story shows that the power vested in the Procurator's office in Jerusalem is a burdensome duty to Pontius Pilate. The extent of power which Pilate wields in the city is defined by the measure of violence with which this power is exercised. The limitations of Pilate's power are obvious from the dialogue which takes place between the Procurator and the High Priest. Pilate has become attracted to the truth contained in Jeshua's ideas and embodied in the vagrant's very existence, but he is fully aware that from the state's point of view any attempt by him to associate with an advocate of anarchist truth will be seen as treason.

The case of Pontius Pilate versus Jeshua demonstrates that the authority of the state is evil but the Procurator is bound to enforce its command. It will be argued later that because of his burden of authority Pilate is obliged to act out of necessity rather than of his own volition. This becomes clear once Jeshua's character has been studied in more detail.

4. Jeshua Ha-Notsri

4.1 Jeshua in Jerusalem

According to M. O. Chudakova Renan's short work on Jesus' life was extremely important to Bulgakov²³. Consequently, Jeshua's circumstances and predicament as narrated by Bulgakov in the Pontius Pilate story will be studied in this thesis with reference to Renan's work.

Discussing the situation in Jerusalem during the Roman occupation Renan refers to one of the most hated practices introduced into the Jewish community by the occupying forces, i.e. the establishment of property records. A tax was then calculated on the basis of property and from the point of view of the Jews this tax was comparable to blasphemy:

Так как Господь Бог есть единственный владыка, которого человек должен признавать, то платить подать светскому Государю, значит некоторым образом ставить его на место Божие.²⁴

Considerable opposition arose against collection of taxes for the state and one of the main movements striving to change this was named after its founder as the Judas-movement. This movement was founded on the following principle:

... никого не следует называть Господом, так как этот титул принадлежит одному только Богу, и что свободу надобно предпочитать жизни.²⁵

Soon the movement assumed the character of an open revolt. It became the main sect in Galilee and its ideology was filled with

Messianic promise and inspired by political aims. It stirred up trouble between the Jews and the Romans. Renan is convinced that Jesus was familiar with this movement, but the kingdom and liberation of which Jesus spoke were, of course, of a totally different order²⁶. However, the political situation and the general attitude towards non-conformists spelled ruin also to Jesus and his philosophy.

According to Renan, Pilate took no interest in the internal quarrels between the Jews. It is understandable that a Roman whose conception of gods was utterly different from the Jewish views on religion would adopt such an outlook. Pilate had managed to stay clear of any dealings with the Judas-sect. However, as soon as he familiarised himself with Jesus' case he undoubtedly realised how easily Jesus' enemies could claim that the vagrant was connected with this mutinous sect²⁷.

In Bulgakov's novel Pilate learns that Jeshua comes from the town of Gamali, the home of Judas, who was the founder of the rebellious movement. When questioning Jeshua about his relationship with Judas of Karioth Pilate appears knowing and his eyes acquire a devilish glint. He knows well how Jeshua's arrest has come about. Pilate is well aware of the means by which the Jews dealt with individuals who rose in rebellion against the rigid Hebrew monotheism.

Renan writes that the Jews had developed a customary way of trapping the individuals whose ideas were unpalatable to them. They would invite the 'heretic' to a place where two witnesses, who would hide themselves, could hear the offending words and also see the culprit in the light of two candles lit for this purpose²⁸. Ignorant of Judas' ulterior motives Jeshua relates to Pilate how he met the young man outside the temple and how pleasantly this man entertained him in his house. Judas was particularly interested to hear Jeshua's thoughts.

Pilate guesses:

- Светильники зажег ... (446)

Pilate's knowledge that Jeshua has fallen victim to a plot conspired for the purpose of trapping the vagrant is confirmed for us by Jeshua's reply:

- Да, ... попросил меня высказать свой взгляд на государственную власть. Его этот вопрос чрезвычайно интересовал. (447)

Bulgakov's fictional account of Jeshua's arrest accords well with Renan's version of the corresponding episode. It reveals fully the extent to which Jeshua's predicament is laden with doom in Jerusalem: ignorant, and innocent, of any foul play in which he has become caught Jeshua's fate is totally at the mercy of his enemies.

In Renan's view the plan of Jesus' enemies consisted of, first, detaining Jesus by means of witnesses, then sentencing him to death on legal grounds and finally having this sentence confirmed by Pilate. According to the Jewish law mockery at God's temple was mockery aimed at God himself. Bulgakov's narrative follows closely Renan's account. As far as the Jewish authorities are concerned Jeshua has spoken against their temple and their faith. He has openly predicted the coming of the Kingdom of Truth and this has given the Jews an opportunity to turn him into a rebel and an offender against the State of Rome. Indeed, he could be easily branded as a follower of the Judas-movement which, as already mentioned, became the main sect in Galilee and whose ideology was filled with Messianic promise and inspired by political aims. The Jews were fully aware that if they presented Jesus/Jeshua to the Procurator as a political offender, the Roman official would be obliged to confirm the death sentence.

A closer examination of Jeshua's personality and outlook explains

why he should stumble so blindly into a trap set by his enemies for his arrest.

5. Pontius Pilate versus Jeshua

Jeshua emerges from the Pontius Pilate story as an individual, an idealist and an anarchist. The main reason for his innocent ignorance is lodged in his personal philosophy. Renan writes:

Этот идеалист, недопускающий раздела между духом и материей,
...²⁹

Jeshua's understanding of and preoccupation with the metaphysical aspects of human existence impair his ability to deal with his immediate physical environment. Previously it was argued that the Procurator emerges from the story as a man of physical sensibility who lacks any metaphysical picture or understanding of human beings and existence. This thesis will now seek to illustrate that Bulgakov has placed the characters of Jeshua and Pilate in opposition to one another in order to bring about the synthesis of ideas on which the novel's underlying paradox is founded.

At first Bulgakov draws attention to the extreme difference in the outward appearance of these men. Jeshua appears in rags, bruised and cut, and yet, showing anxious curiosity as he sees the Procurator. Pilate, donning the handsome white cloak with the blood-red lining, shows immutable indifference toward anything but his head-ache. In the course of their dialogue Jeshua diagnoses Pilate's trouble: the Procurator is too much locked up within himself and he has lost his faith in people. Jeshua, on the other hand, holds no secrets within himself, his thoughts are open to everybody who wishes to hear them. He has an absolute belief in people: all men are good. Ironically, Pilate who is served by a host of people has lost his belief in men while Jeshua whom fellow human beings have subjected to violence and

derision remains true to his ideals.

Jeshua is out of touch with the political and social realities circumscribing life in Jerusalem. Renan considers it unlikely that Jesus had any definite idea about the meaning of the Roman Empire just as he himself was quite unknown in the Greek and Roman lands³⁰. Pilate, on the other hand, is depicted by Bulgakov as being acutely aware of the delicate balance of power on which his office, and life, depend. Pilate's questioning of Jeshua reveals naivety which characterises the vagrant's attitude towards the imperial power. In the course of the dialogue it becomes clear that in Jeshua's case the absolutes of truth, justice and good tower above all other considerations. Pilate is the very opposite of Jeshua. His attitude to Tiberius and Rome is defined by his utmost sensitivity to the dictates of political expediency: first and foremost, Pilate is concerned with his public role; he is a conformist and an unwavering supporter of the state's authority.

The most obvious manifestation of the paradoxical opposition in which Bulgakov places these two protagonists is contained in the casting of the roles of the captor versus the captive. If these roles are determined by outward appearances or external circumstances only there is no doubt that Jeshua is the prisoner and Pilate his potential liberator. However, during the questioning it turns out that these roles are interchangeable: Pilate, too, turns out to be a prisoner and Jeshua is shown to have the means of liberating him. The Procurator's realisation of how closely his fate has come to converge on that of the vagrant is expressed in Pilate's horrified outburst which brings to a conclusion the dialogue between the two protagonists:

- ... О, боги, боги! Или ты думаешь, что я готов занять

твое место? Я твоих мыслей не разделяю! (448)

This convergence of Pilate's and Jeshua's fates upon one another establishes between them a tie of brotherhood which is sealed by blood through Jeshua's execution and which entwines the two protagonists irretrievably in a shared destiny. The final realisation of Jeshua's and Pilate's joint immortality is prefigured in a dream where the vagrant philosopher assures the Procurator:

- Мы теперь будем всегда вместе, ... Раз один - то, значит, тут же и другой! Помянут меня, - сейчас же помянут и тебя! Меня - подкидыша, сына неизвестных родителей, и тебя - сына короля-звездочета и дочери мельника, красавицы Пилы. (735)

By juxtaposing the characters of Pontius Pilate and Jeshua with one another Bulgakov emphasises that:

- 1) Pilate is a realist while Jeshua is an idealist;
- 2) Pilate's outlook is dominated by physical sensibility while Jeshua is primarily concerned with spiritual aspects of man's life;
- 3) Pilate believes in the authority of the kingdom of Caesar while Jeshua advocates anarchism, as defined by Berdyaev.³¹

In general, Pilate's character represents the public persona of a conformist in a society which is rigidly regulated at once by the dictates of the Jewish and Roman laws. Jeshua's character, on the other hand, reflects the private aspirations of an individual who rejects the confines of any dogmatic order that might be imposed from outside. Jeshua's thoughts and code of behaviour are based wholly on his instinctive understanding of the concepts of truth and good. Pilate's suppressed awareness of the metaphysical reality which is manifest in Jeshua's personal philosophy makes the Procurator's head ache and turns him into a cynic. Pilate cannot help ridiculing the goodness and

selflessness reflected in Jeshua's ideas. At the same time, it is the total lack of Pilate's qualities in Jeshua's character that makes the vagrant appear so simple and naive in his understanding of the everyday realities of Jerusalem.

In the course of Pilate's questioning of Jeshua the latter remains unchanged as far as his beliefs are concerned while the Procurator begins to respond to Jeshua's influence. At first Pilate and Jeshua become attracted to one another and soon they are seen to be entirely dependent upon one another; each of them is shown as being incomplete unless complemented by the other. On the narrative level this is shown by the fact that Pilate's one-sided head-ache is cured as the metaphysical dimension of his consciousness begins to revive through his contact with Jeshua. In Jeshua's case, it is shown by the fact that Jeshua is resurrected at the end of the novel and Pilate's responsibility for the execution must also be seen reflected in this resurrection: without the execution no resurrection would have been possible. Thus Jeshua's immortality is, in a sense, brought about by Pilate who also comes to share it. In the course of the interview the Procurator's cynicism has been pierced by Jeshua's idealistic humanism. Pilate's behaviour can be interpreted as a primary stage of spiritual revival at which his understanding is torn between hope and despair, between the wish to believe and the obligation to doubt.

6. Good and evil as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'

According to Jeshua's assurance (735) the Procurator and the vagrant are joined together for eternity through Jeshua's execution. This joint immortality contains the synthesis of the ideas which these protagonists personify and which have been discussed above. A closer examination of this synthesis helps to determine the moral value of

these protagonists' actions in the context of their shared predicament in Jerusalem. On the cross Jeshua delivers his final testimony through proclaiming that cowardice is one of the greatest sins (721) while Pilate remains adamant in his conviction that treason is the gravest crime (446). These assertions give rise to the following questions:

Does Pontius Pilate act out of cowardice in Jeshua's case?

Is Jeshua guilty of treason? Does he violate the authority of Rome or of the Jewish religion?

An affirmative answer to these questions would render Pilate and Jeshua morally worthless: the Procurator would be branded as a coward and the vagrant as a traitor to the state. It must be noted here that neither acknowledges the validity of the state which the other represents. The rendering of the main characters of the story as criminals or villains would provide a neat and unusual, even if blasphemous, denouement for a work which is based on the crucial event of the Christian myth. In fact, answers to the above questions must be sought, not in the light of either one of these statements, but in terms of Pilate's and Jeshua's shared predicament in Jerusalem.

The synthesis of the ideas which Pilate and Jeshua represent must in this context be examined in terms of freedom and necessity of the protagonists' choice as regards their shared predicament. The precariousness of Pilate's office in Jerusalem has been outlined earlier. It has been concluded that, on the one hand, Pilate's position is undermined by the Jewish power hierarchy and the sanctity of the local religious law and, on the other hand, Pilate is terrified of becoming the target of Emperor Tiberius' anger. Thus not only his public position, but also his personal safety are seriously threatened. Pilate himself admits this openly in a rhetorical question addressed

to Jeshua: does the vagrant think that a Roman Procurator would be foolish enough to exchange places with his prisoner (448); that is, to release Jeshua and thus risk a death-sentence being conferred upon himself? Pilate wants to release the prisoner and tries his utmost to do so but his attempts fail. Jeshua remains unaware of the Procurator's cunning rescue attempts and he moves unswervingly towards the Kingdom of Truth and Justice. According to him it is pleasant to speak the truth and thus he fails to take advantage of Pilate's stealthy prompting which calls for the vagrant to answer craftily so that his life may be spared.

If Pilate's handling of Jeshua's case is considered in terms of freedom and necessity it becomes obvious that the Procurator has no freedom of choice in determining the course of Jeshua's destiny: Pilate acts out of necessity which is dictated to him by the Jewish religious authorities, or by his instinct of self-preservation. The Procurator is fully aware that Jeshua has been arrested as a result of conspiracy: the local priests fear that Jeshua's teachings might turn the people against the priests themselves. The only alternative course of action in Jeshua's case would involve the Procurator in exchanging places with the vagrant, i.e. through protesting openly against the decision made by the Jewish Sanhedrin, Pilate would be denounced and, most likely, sentenced to death for an attempt to help a political offender. Thus it must be concluded that Pilate's public and personal survival in Jerusalem depends on his unquestioning submission to the dictates of necessity. The alternatives of freedom and necessity exist for the Procurator only as a choice between life and death. It is in this context that Bulgakov poses the question of whether in his handling of Jeshua's case Pilate can be termed guilty of moral cowardice.

Jeshua's predicament, on the other hand, remains totally unaffected by the conflict between public duty and private conscience. Jeshua follows the dictates of his own heart where the code of his instinctive morality is lodged. Thus in his case good and evil are determined by intuition which endows him with a certainty of moral judgement: intuition does not accommodate any argument or compromise but relies, without questioning, on the individual's moral instinct³². It is in this context that Jeshua advocates the right of individual conscience as separate from the political or social law and that he sees this right as constituting a new power, that is, the spiritual power. In terms of freedom and necessity it must be argued that, paradoxically, the vagrant has no choice either in his defence of the ideas which aim to make manifest the reality of the spiritual power. Then the original question of whether Jeshua is guilty of treason must be qualified as follows: does Jeshua's uncompromising adherence to the dictates of his free conscience, of the spiritual power which arises from within, make him an offender against the temporal power of Rome or the authority of the Jewish religion?

The answer to the question of Pilate's and Jeshua's guilt is given in the synthesis of the ideas which emerge from the juxtaposition of these characters in the first place. This answer is illuminated by G. C. Jung's statement that men 'must beware of thinking of good and evil as absolute opposites'³³. Above an attempt has been made to suggest that it would be just as naive to attribute Jeshua's execution purely to the Procurator's cowardice as it would be to argue that Jeshua is guilty of treason. In his book about the life of Jesus Renan asserts that history becomes impossible unless men acknowledge that many standards of sincerity exist amongst them: e.g. in Bulgakov's novel

Pilate looks at the truth from the legal point of view while Jeshua measures it against his faith. Furthermore, Renan explains that faith discards any other law than the interests of what it believes to be the truth³⁴. Jeshua stands by a faith whose thesis he advocates by claiming that good people are capable of mutilating a fellow human being - as, he presumes, must have happened in Mark Muribellum's case. Such a claim is bound to strike Pilate as wildly outrageous and unsound as it shows that Jeshua not only fails to take into account the social and political realities of his society but he also wholly dismisses the existence of any law other than that which serves to enhance the truth upon which his faith is founded. It is inconceivable in terms of any code of morality that people who mutilate their fellow human beings could be called good. Pilate's interest is aroused by the vagrant and his philosophy, but because of his cynical outlook on life he cannot help showing incredulity towards any faith whose thesis may be defended by such an apparently contradictory and naive claim as that made by Jeshua. Pilate himself has no faith in people. His relationships with other human beings are governed entirely by the law, that is, by the dictates which outline the duties pertaining to the Procurator's office. Thus the level of sincerity to which Pilate adheres issues from the law and, in contrast to Jeshua, his code of morality emerges from dictates imposed upon his person by an external factor.

By demonstrating that Pilate and Jeshua view life from different levels of sincerity Bulgakov shows that good and evil are not necessarily opposites of each other but, on the contrary, they may be seen, in Jung's words, as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'³⁵. In Bulgakov's work the 'paradoxical whole' represents the truth as it is seen at once both from Pilate's and Jeshua's differing points of view.

In other words, for Pilate the law provides the answers to the questions of right and wrong; to Jeshua these matters are determined by his faith. On the basis of this reasoning it seems justifiable to argue that Jeshua's last words on the cross - cowardice is one of the greatest sins - refer primarily to himself in the sense that they express Jeshua's sincere belief in the fact that he has acted according to his faith, fulfilled the destiny ascribed to him by this faith and thus remained innocent of cowardice. Similarly, the principle which governs Pilate's behaviour in Jerusalem states that treason is the gravest crime. Again it seems appropriate to insist that this principle applies first and foremost to the Procurator himself, i.e. it is an expression of his bitter but genuine understanding of the necessity to abide by the law and Caesar's command. Jeshua's philosophy emerges as the more compelling of the two protagonists' views on life because it is founded on the freedom of individual conscience, i.e. it is not bound by the necessity of public duty which governs Pilate's predicament.

Pilate and Jeshua attain joint immortality through the Jerusalem execution. Pilate comes to hate this immortality and fame and declares after nearly two thousand years that he would gladly change places with Matthew the Levite (797). Pilate cannot acquire peace until the Master releases him to walk with Jeshua along the path of moonlight. Like Ivan Bezdomny alias Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov, Pilate suffers from attacks of restlessness at full moon. The devil relates:

- ... Около двух тысяч лет сидит он на этой площадке и спит, но когда приходит полная луна, как видите, его терзает бессонница. ... Если верно, что трусость - самый тяжкий порок, то, пожалуй, собака в нем не виновата. ... Ну что ж, тот, кто любит, должен разделять участь того, кого он любит. (796)

- ... он говорит, что и при луне ему нет покоя и что у него плохая должность. (797)

The devil reveals that Pilate's cause has been pleaded by Jeshua and he says that it is now up to the Master to release the Procurator by means of finishing his story with one sentence. Thus in Master i Margarita Bulgakov employs the Master to release Pilate from the burden of the sinner in order that he might share in the glory of the saviour³⁶. This happens through the presentation of Pilate's character as part of the 'paradoxical whole' which is realised in the joint immortality shared by the vagrant and the Procurator. By confirming the decision to execute his potential saviour Pilate has effected the saviour's resurrection through which he himself may be released from his burden of sin.

7. Faith and fear

In his work Renan depicts Jesus as a perfect idealist and also as an anarchist who had no understanding of civil government. Renan goes so far as to insist that to Jesus, in general, matter represented simply a sign of the idea, that is, a material manifestation of a non-material concept³⁷. In the Pontius Pilate story Jeshua's character parallels closely Renan's Christ. As a perfect idealist Jeshua does not consider the consequences of his single-minded adherence to the truth on which his faith is founded. During the questioning Pilate tries to warn him of these consequences but Jeshua fails to respond to these warnings. It becomes evident that Pilate and Jeshua differ from one another utterly in the sense that Jeshua has faith in the future, in the coming of the Kingdom of Truth and Justice, while Pilate lives in constant fear of the future, as regards both Tiberius' anger and also any threat of Caesar's power being replaced by another.

It seems appropriate that a discussion on the theme of faith and fear in the Pontius Pilate story should include direct reference to

the Master, the creator of this story, whose own experience of fear (admittedly after his story was spurned by the world) has been extreme:

- ... А затем, представьте себе, наступила ... стадия - страха. ... Словом, наступила стадия психического заболевания. ... мне казалось, что через оконце, хотя оно и было закрыто, влезает какой-то спрут с очень длинными и холодными щупальцами. (562)

It is significant that the Master is stricken by this fear only after he has arrived at some considerable understanding of his critics' psychology. He explains to Ivan what he has detected in almost all of the hostile criticism:

Что-то на редкость фальшивое и неуверенное чувствовалось буквально в каждой строчке этих статей, несмотря на их грозный и уверенный тон. Мне все казалось, ... что авторы этих статей говорят не то, что они хотят сказать, и что их ярость вызывается именно этим. (561-2)

The Master's critics do not say what they want to say because they fear the consequences of speaking the truth. They are acutely aware of the fact that their society recognises, and allows, only the kind of truth which serves to enhance the authority of the official dogma. Since the critics have no faith in their work their existence is filled with frustration. Ironically, it is the anger arising from this frustration which fires the attacks made by the critics on non-conformist literature, not the literature itself. The Master understands the nature of the confinement in which the critics are imprisoned by their fear of breaking the vicious circle. As a result of this knowledge the Master himself becomes gripped by helpless fear which, in his opinion, is comparable to a psychological illness.

The next stage in the development of the Master's psychological condition is marked by his attempt to destroy the story by fire. This attempt shows that the Master has finally lost his faith in the future of his creative issue. The question which arises from this attempt

is related to the measurement of the moral value of the Master's action: does the Master act out of moral cowardice thus betraying his creation? The same question was applied to Pilate's case earlier.

In the course of Bulgakov's novel both the Master and Pilate are seen to digress from the official path for a time in an attempt to further a personal cause in which they have faith; they try to fight - to a varying degree - for the survival and future viability of this cause. However, they are eventually driven by fear to give in to the opposition for the sake of their own survival: the Master burns his manuscript and Pilate confirms the decision on Jeshua's execution. Neither the Master nor Pilate lose faith in the truth manifest in the cause itself, that is, in the case of the former in his novel and in the case of the latter in Jeshua's ideas. They simply lose faith in its future viability insofar as they themselves might act for its implementation. In the novel Bulgakov implies that the Master ends up in a labour camp. On return he is so thoroughly infected by fear that he enters voluntarily into the mental asylum. Pilate, on the other hand, leads a life of isolation and loneliness which is poisoned by his extreme hatred of the people and the city of Jerusalem. Jeshua accepts death without protest since trying to avoid it would be tantamount to cowardice and, as it is made clear, he believes cowardice to be one of the greatest sins. He is resurrected in the Kingdom of Light and Pilate is finally released to join him. It must be concluded that in Pilate's, like the Master's, case fear conquers faith to the extent that these characters cease to fight for the truth of which their intuition informs them, while in Jeshua's case faith conquers not only fear but also death.

It is important to remember that the Master is the author of the Pontius Pilate story and consequently both Pilate and Jeshua represent

the creative issue of his imagination. In other words, just as certain aspects of the Master's character are identifiable with Pilate's propensities to good and evil, part of his personality is intimately related to Jeshua. Thus the Master's predicament in Moscow may be defined in terms of the synthesis which arises from the juxtaposition of Pilate's character with Jeshua. This synthesis, undermined by the conflict of faith and fear, gives birth to a paradoxical code of morality operative at once respective to and irrespective of the code of behaviour dictated by the official dogma. In practical terms this means that a genuine writer fears constantly the consequences of revealing the truth which he has come to perceive through his intuition rather than his society's dogmatic indoctrination. In these circumstances the good (faith in truth) in which the writer partakes is relativised by the evil (fear of revealing truth) and vice versa. Accordingly, in the writer's case good and evil no longer exist as absolute moral opposites but as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'³⁸. In the Master's case the conflict between fear and faith dissolves into indifference, and finally oblivion. At the end of the novel it is faintly reflected only in the lunacy and dreams of Ivan Nikolayich Poniryov, but like any other dream-like vision it vanishes in the bright light of the morning.

8. Conclusion

To sum up the discussion on the Pontius Pilate story it is possible to claim that the philosophical kernel of Bulgakov's work consists of the depiction of Pilate's and Jeshua's characters in such a manner that, rather than representing a simple opposition of good and evil, they form a synthesis which reflects the moral absolutes as 'halves of a paradoxical whole'³⁹. In this context the moral worth of Pilate's and Jeshua's

behaviour and actions must be measured in terms of freedom and necessity of choice. The examination of the Procurator's and the vagrant's predicaments in these terms reveals the extent to which each of them is susceptible to faith and fear.

In the Pontius Pilate story Bulgakov illustrates through Jeshua how the rejection of any dogmatic outlook on life, that is, the fulfilment of freedom of conscience, affects an individual. In an earlier novel, Belaya gvardiya,⁴⁰ a priest makes the following pronouncement:

- Тяжкое , тяжкое время, ... но унывать - то не
следует ... (16)

Jeshua's example in the story represents a disposition of mind which is the opposite of despondency. Pilate, on the other hand, has lost faith in people and feels at first nothing but total indifference towards the vagrant's case. Also, the Master assigns himself to the seclusion of the asylum where he can remain indifferent to all that happens outside. Through his faith Jeshua maintains his freedom of conscience, while through their fear Pilate and the Master give way to indifference. In the novel the devil declares his axiom according to which everyone will receive according to his belief. Thus Jeshua's perception and pursuit of the metaphysical truth brings him death in the physical world and immortality in the fullest sense of the word on the metaphysical dimension. Pilate's indifference has been pierced by Jeshua's enthusiasm and the yearning which this awakens in the Procurator eventually leads him to a renewed contact with the vagrant. The Master perceives the truth about good and evil as 'halves of a paradoxical whole' and he tries to communicate his knowledge to the world through his novel. The world's violent rejection of his offering infects him with fear which turns into indifference. He is finally rescued from his apathy by Margarita's fearless love (reminiscent of

Jeshua's fearless idealism and faith).

This is the essence of the philosophy which expresses Bulgakov's understanding of the truth about good and evil as it relates to life in the Soviet society in the 1930's. Bulgakov's statement rests upon the Christian prototypes as depicted in the Bible, but in it the Bible myth has been reshaped in such a manner that it helps to explain the meaning of life in the author's own society and time. The following ideas of Jung apply well to Bulgakov's creation of the Pontius Pilate story, and also the novel as a whole:

The need for mythic statements is satisfied when we frame a view of the world which adequately explains the meaning of human existence in the cosmos, a view which springs from our psychic wholeness, from the co-operation between conscious and unconscious. Meaninglessness inhibits fulness of life and is therefore equivalent to illness. Meaning makes a great many things endurable - perhaps everything. ... For it is not that "God" is a myth, but that myth is a revelation of a divine life in man.⁴¹

Soviet reality is made endurable to Bulgakov because his act of depicting the writer's dilemma through the examination of moral absolutes in relation to Pontius Pilate's predicament in Jerusalem endows his life with meaning. Thus Master i Margarita may be considered as a 'mythical statement' which in its attempt to explain the truth about evil penetrates into the ontology of life. The 'mythical statement' is made by a writer whose aspirations vacillate between fear and faith in a society which rejects myths as nonsense.

CONCLUSION

Mikhail Bulgakov demonstrates in Master i Margarita¹ that in an authoritarian state the creative artist is constantly torn between his faith in the revelation of the truth as he understands it (i.e. faith in his creation) and his fear of the consequences which might ensue from this revelation. It is true that Bulgakov, although exhausted from being spurned and attacked by critics, succeeded in his unyielding efforts to continue writing up to the very end of his life. Yet none of his work was published in the Soviet Union after 1927 until the appearance of Master i Margarita in Moskva in 1966².

Bulgakov's creative career spans the period when

Some writers, ... chose silence as their "genre" out of fear; Bulgakov was no less afraid, but he wrote anyway. Those who compromised completely often did so out of desire to belong; Bulgakov also wished to belong, but compromised very little. Nor did he take refuge in cunning vagueness: Bulgakov's thoughts were down on paper with sufficient clarity, ...³

However, a feeling of utmost frustration and impotence emerges again and again from Bulgakov's letters and remarks relating to his own position in Soviet society. The mood out of which Pontius Pilate's predicament arises in Master i Margarita is well illustrated by Bulgakov's words in a letter written in April 1932:

Оправдание есть, но утешения нет.⁴

There is no consolation for the individual who turns away from truth. This forms the premise for Bulgakov's exposition of the truth about evil in the novel.

The purpose of this thesis has not been to outline the way in which Bulgakov's art mirrors the biographical circumstances of his life. Rather this study has sought to illuminate the writer's dilemma in a society where freedom of conscience is set against the necessity of given moral choices. In this way the question of 'justification' is presented, not answered, in relation to the social and political

realities which define the artist's or the writer's environment and also in relation to the demands which issue from his creative instinct.

Master i Margarita has been linked here with the protest expressed in Vekhi's essays⁵ at the beginning of this century against a dogmatic rationalist and materialist outlook on life. An attempt has been made to show that in general the novel serves to undermine and deride the notion that utility should triumph at the expense of culture. By upholding the metaphysical and irrational aspects of being - which are seen to be evil from the official viewpoint - the image of a whole human being is traced in the novel.

It has been argued that the literati of the novel's Moscow chapters are seeking to live a lie by ignoring the metaphysical aspects of existence. Furthermore, it has been claimed that the ordinary citizens are also trying to turn away from the truth as it concerns their everyday existence in the city. Belief in magic and superstition enables them to deny responsibility for their own and their society's actions. In this context Jeshua's pronouncement that cowardice is one of the greatest sins echoes throughout the novel alongside the devil's axiom that everyone will receive according to their belief.

The Pontius Pilate story, like Woland's living globe, allows the author to focus effectively on the particular ethical dilemma which forms the philosophical kernel of the novel as a whole. Bulgakov depicts this dilemma through the juxtaposition of freedom with necessity, faith with fear and courage with cowardice. Bulgakov suggests that, like the joint immortality of Pontius Pilate and Jeshua, these concepts cannot exist in isolation from their opposites; on the contrary, they depend on their opposites. The devil draws attention

to the importance of shadows, or of evil: the denial of shadows negates life itself.

Despite the serious philosophical and ethical considerations presented in Master i Margarita the overall mood of the novel is jocular. Bulgakov's debt, stylistic and philosophical, to the 19th century Russian writers - first and foremost to Gogol and Dostoevsky - is easily detectable in the work. The novel is rooted in the 19th century tradition which respects the spiritual nature of man.

Thus, it must be acknowledged that Master i Margarita bears witness to the claim that Mikhail Bulgakov cannot be seen as a martyr to his predicament but rather as the devil's cunning disciple who took pleasure in unveiling the truth about evil in his time and society.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. See preface, p. (vi).
3. These episodes appear in Master i Margarita on pp. 673 and 675 and they will be discussed in chapter V, pp. 159-160.
4. P. A. Florensky, Mnimosti v geometrii (Moscow, 1922). Bulgakov's interest in this work is explained in M. O. Chudakova's article 'Uslovie sushchestvovaniya' V mire knig No. 12 (1974), p. 80.
5. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 329.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. E. Proffer, A Pictorial Biography of Mikhail Bulgakov (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 16.
3. See preface, p. (vi).
4. D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature (London, 1968), pp. 407-9.
5. 'Socialist reality' is intended here to be read as a contradiction in terms.
6. Sergei Bulgakov's essay appears in Vekhi on pp. 23-69. A. C. Wright states that Sergei Bulgakov was a cousin to Afanasy Bulgakov, Mikhail Bulgakov's father, in Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations (Toronto, 1978), p. 3. E. Proffer explains that Sergei Bulgakov was 'claimed by some of the family as a relation'; Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 1. Thus, perhaps, a distant uncle.
7. Vol'nyy, 'Grekh intelligentsii' Grazhdanin No. 51-2 (1909), pp. 2-3.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
10. Berdyaev's essay 'Filosofskaya istina i intelligentskaya pravda' appears in Vekhi on pp. 1-22.

11. In this context the term 'Catholic' is used in a derogatory sense. It refers to the kind of ideology and mentality which Dostoevsky ascribes to the Roman Catholic Church as an institution and to its followers in the Grand Inquisitor legend.
12. The radical intelligentsia's attitude to people is discussed further in this chapter on pp. 29-30.
13. Sergei Bulgakov states that enlightenment was regarded by the Russian intelligentsia as synonymous with religious indifference; this chapter, p. 17. Frank claims in his Vekhi essay that in the Russian context culture was identified with utilitarianism, this chapter, p. 32.
14. This definition is derived from Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary (Edinburgh, 1972), p. 236.
15. Berdyaev argues that the Russian intelligentsia could not embrace concepts of objectivity and universalism; this chapter, p. 15. See note 13 for Frank's view of Russian single-mindedness.
16. My underlining.
17. The growth of man's arrogance is also discussed in chapter II, pp. 36-9 and in chapter III, p. 56.
18. Sergei Bulgakov's poetic call for inspiration appears in Vekhi on pp. 68-9.
19. Gershenzon's essay is entitled 'Tvorcheskoe samosoznanie', pp. 70-96.
20. F. Fordham, An Introduction to Jung's Psychology (Harmondsworth, 1966), p. 21.
21. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 382-3. (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. XI, pp. 468 f. and p. 190).
22. See also this chapter, p. 13, on Berdyaev's view of the intelligentsia's false love for mankind.
23. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 330.
24. Frank's essay 'Etika nigilizma' appears in Vekhi on pp. 175-210.
25. See notes 13 and 15 which relate to Berdyaev's and Sergei Bulgakov's views on the narrowness of Russian radical thought.
26. The following Russian terms are used here by Frank: 'утилитарический альтруизм' and 'социалист', Vekhi, p. 192.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. See preface, p. (vi).
3. See M. O. Chudakova, 'Usloviye sushchestvovaniya' V mire knig No. 12 (1974), p. 79. Also Chudakova, 'Arkhiy M. A. Bulgakova' Zapiski otдела rukopisey Vypusk 37 (Moscow, 1976), p. 73:
'Главным источником для "демонической" сферы романа послужила книга М. А. Орлова "История сношений человека с дьяволом" ... в тетради вперемежку делаются выписки то из этой книги, то из различных статей энциклопедического словаря Брокгауза - Ефрона, имеющих отношение к демонологии.'
4. M. A. Orlov, Istoriya snosheniy cheloveka s d'yavolom (St. Petersburg, 1904).
5. F. A. Brokgauz and I. A. Efron: Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' (St. Petersburg, 1890-1907). From now on this work will be referred to as the Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia.
6. Orlov, *op. cit.*, this discussion is based on information derived from pp. 4-7.
7. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XX (St. Petersburg, 1893), pp. 727-9.
8. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 334.
9. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XX, pp. 727-9.
10. See this chapter, p. 37.
11. See this chapter, p. 39.
12. Genesis 1:26.
13. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XIX (St. Petersburg, 1893), pp. 374-7.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 375.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 375.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 375.
17. See chapter I, pp. 20-24.
18. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XIX, p. 376.
19. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 334.
20. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XIX, p. 377.

21. Jung, *op. cit.*, pp. 334 and 338.
22. See chapter I, p. 27.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. See chapter II, p. 49.
3. See preface, p. (vi).
4. See chapter I, p. 29.
5. See preface, p. (vi). The Grand Inquisitor legend is related on pp. 270-90.
6. Ivan Karamazov's encounter with the devil is given in a chapter entitled 'Chert. Koshmar Ivana Fedorovicha', pp. 686-704.
7. M. A. Orlov writes in Istoriya snosheniy cheloveka s d'yavolom (St. Petersburg, 1904) that according to a Swedish belief the devil appears to be ill at the sabbath and the guests do their best to cure him; p. 37. In Master i Margarita Woland tells Margarita before the Ball, p. 674.
8. Ivan Karamazov's devil refers to his rheumatism on p. 691 and explains at great length how he caught a cold on pp. 692-3.
9. See chapter I, pp. 20-4, on man-godhood and also Chapter II, pp. 36-8, on man's increased arrogance.
10. See chapter I, p. 10.
11. At this point it is necessary to clarify that the term 'unconscious' is used here in the sense it was understood by C. G. Jung. In An Introduction to Jung's Psychology (Harmondsworth, 1966) F. Fordham explains that according to Jung: '... the unconscious is the matrix of consciousness, and in it are to be found the germs of new possibilities of life. The conscious aspect of the psyche might be compared to an island rising from the sea - we only see the part above the water, but a much vaster unknown realm spreads below, and this could be likened to the unconscious.

The island is the ego, the knowing, willing "I", the centre of consciousness.' P. 21.
12. It is important to note here that the pranks which the devil's assistants play upon the Moscow citizens are not so much related to the unconscious life of man as to the conscious, but in-admissible, life of the citizens whom they show to be torn between greed and fear.
13. See chapter II, p. 36. Socrates' encounters with the demon are

related by Solov'ev in the Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XIX (St. Petersburg, 1893), p. 376.

14. See chapter II, p. 49.
15. Solov'ev's essay on 'Demon' appears in the Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XIX, pp. 374-7.
16. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 302.
17. F. Fordham, An Introduction to Jung's Psychology (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 105-6.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-3.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
22. See chapter I, p. 31.
23. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 382.
24. See this chapter, p. 64.
25. It is helpful to cite in more detail how Jung understood the God-image. In Memories, Dreams, Reflections, p. 383, he explains: 'It is only through the psyche that we can establish that God acts upon us, but we are unable to distinguish whether these actions emanate from God or from the unconscious. We cannot tell whether God and the unconscious are two different entities. ... empirically it can be established, with a sufficient degree of probability, that there is in the unconscious an archetype of wholeness which manifests itself spontaneously in dreams, etc., and a tendency, independent of the conscious will, to relate other archetypes to this centre. Consequently, it does not seem improbable that the archetype produces a symbolism which has always characterized and expressed the Deity ... The God-image does not coincide with the unconscious as such, but with a special content of it, namely the archetype of the self. It is this archetype from which we can no longer distinguish the God-image empirically.' (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. XI, pp. 468 f.)
26. *Ibid.*, p. 380. (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. X, in preparation at the time.)
27. *Ibid.*, p. 381. (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. VIII, p. 213.)
28. Fordham, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
29. This view is put forward by Ivan Karamazov's devil on p. 703.

30. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 330.
31. Published in L. Milne's 'K biografii M. A. Bulgakova', The New Review/Novyy zhurnal Kn. 111 (New York, 1973), p. 153.
32. Bulgakov's letter to P. S. Popov dated 14.3.1935. Glagol 2 (Ann Arbor, 1978), p. 129.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
34. Milne, *op. cit.*, p. 155. As regards Bulgakov's letters to the Soviet authorities and to Stalin in particular Milne explains: 'Поскольку эти материалы нашлись не в архиве самого Сталина, а в личном архиве Булгакова, неизвестно, отправил ли он эти письма в те инстанции, куда они адресованы.' P. 151.
35. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 338.
38. Fordham, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
39. Jung, *op. cit.*, pp. 341-2.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 383. (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. XI, pp. 468 f.)
41. *Ibid.*, p. 383. (Quoted from Jung's Collected Works Vol. XI, p. 190.)
42. *Ibid.*, p. 341.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 341.
44. See this chapter, p. 80.
45. See this chapter, pp. 81-2.
46. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 330.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 330.
49. See this chapter, pp. 99-101.
50. See chapter I, p. 29.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 10 and 18.
52. A different eternity is depicted by Bulgakov in the closing paragraphs of his earlier novel Belaya gvardiya, p. 270. See this chapter, p. 109. For the edition of Belaya gvardiya see preface, p. (vi).

53. The information given here on the devil's trickery is derived from Orlov, Istoriya snoshenii cheloveka s d'yavolom, pp. 45-46.
54. See chapter II, p. 47.
55. N. Ya. Mandel'stam, Vospominaniya (New York, 1970), p. 25.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 305.
57. See chapter I, p. 29.
58. Mandel'stam, *op. cit.*, p. 305.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 297-8.
60. In Belaya gvardiya the unnatural life in the city is also connected with the electric lights which are switched on at night. Then the cowards who have fled from Moscow crawl out and life begins in the artificially lit city, pp. 52-6.
61. See preface, p. (vi).
62. R. N. Carew-Hunt, The Theory and Practice of Communism (Harmondsworth, 1950); Lenin's 'Address to the 3rd Congress of the Russian Young Communist League' of 2 October 1920 is cited on pp. 113-4.
63. See chapter I, p. 31.
64. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 330.
65. P. A. Kropotkin, 'Mutual Aid', Selections from his Writings, chosen by H. Read (London, 1942), p. 45.
66. In this context the Grand Inquisitor's power is seen to be based on his apparently superior knowledge of human nature.
67. In 'Velikiy inkvizitor', p. 280: 'чудо, тайна и авторитет'.
68. See chapter I, pp. 13 and 29.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. J. M. McGlathery, Mysticism and Sexuality: E. T. A. Hoffmann, European University Studies, Series I, German Language and Literature, Vol. 450 (Las Vegas, 1981), p. 21-2.
3. I. Mirimsky, 'Sotsial'naya fantastika Gofmana' Literaturnaya ucheba 5 (Moscow, 1938), pp. 63-87.
4. M. O. Chudakova, 'Uslovia sushchestvovaniya' V mire knig No. 12 (1974), p. 80.

5. See chapter III, p. 80.
6. Mirimsky, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
7. E. Proffer, Neizdannyy Bulgakov (Ann Arbor, 1977), pp. 7-8.
8. Mirimsky, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
10. Bulgakov himself was photographed wearing his 'Master's cap': E. Proffer, A Pictorial Biography of Bulgakov (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 121.
11. It is interesting to note that the devil is also present in this episode which must be the only time when these three characters appear together in the novel, p. 533. In this connection it is also interesting to observe what Andrei Sinyavsky said about the split of his personality in a lecture given at Edinburgh University on 23 February 1984. He assured the audience that Andrei Sinyavsky could never don the mask of Abram Tertz as this mask represents the fantastic in his literary style while Abram Tertz would not write learned articles on literature. According to Sinyavsky, these two personalities were quite different even in outward appearance, both in his mind and on paper: Abram Tertz is the younger man whose cap will fall down on his face, who is full of life and who carries a knife in his pocket; Andrei Sinyavsky, on the other hand, is the less spontaneous, less exciting side of his personality. He admitted that there were moments when the two personalities came together, perhaps, for instance, when he was writing an article from the stylistic point of view on literature. He added somewhat later that the true writer, i.e. Abram Tertz, has, of course, been branded a criminal in Soviet society.
12. F. Fordham, An Introduction to Jung's Psychology (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 21 and 23.
13. Mirimsky, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
14. A communal building - reminiscent, perhaps, of the inmates' living quarters in a prison camp - stands amongst the trees. This impression is enhanced by Margarita's imaginary conversation somewhat later; see chapter V, p. 165.
15. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 329.
16. E. I. Zamyatin, My (New York, 1967).
17. See chapter I, p. 16.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. P. A. Florensky, Mnimosti v geometrii (Moscow, 1922).
3. According to M. O. Chudakova's article 'Uslovie sushchestvovaniya' V mire knig 12 (1974) Florensky's book was one of Bulgakov's first acquisitions in Moscow and parts of it were heavily underlined by him with coloured pencils; p. 80.
4. Florensky, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
7. This suggestion is based on ideas derived from T. Bergin, An approach to Dante (London, 1965), p. 227.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
9. Florensky, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-53. Some interesting thoughts on this topic are given in 'Bulgakov, Dante, and Relativity' by B. Beatie and P. Powell, Canadian-American Slavic Studies 15, Nos. 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1981), pp. 250-70. Beatie and Powell assume that the first 45 pages of Florensky's book were of no interest to Bulgakov and they concentrate on studying that part of Florensky's work where the journey of Dante and Virgil in the Divina Commedia is used as a metaphor to explain a particular conception of the imaginary and as an indication that Dante had anticipated ideas which became common with the development of the theory of relativity; p. 251. This thesis attempts to show that the underlying principles of Florensky's treatise as a whole serve well to illuminate the cosmology of Master i Margarita.
10. For suggestions of further parallels which can be found between Divina Commedia and Master i Margarita see E. Proffer, Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984), pp. 646-7.
11. Florensky, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
12. My underlining.
13. My underlining.
14. E. Renan, The Life of Jesus (London, 1927), p. 7. The English version is used for reference when the argument pursued is not directly concerned with the circumstances of 'the life of Jesus'.
15. Similarly, Pontius Pilate calls for poison during Jeshua's questioning. The Procurator's thoughts return to the reality of the situation: "Яду мне, яду!" (441).
16. Renan, *op. cit.*, pp. 238-9.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
18. See this chapter, p. 154.
19. In the Book of Revelation 9:11 Abaddon appears as 'the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon'.
20. In this discussion the primary source on Hoffmann is S. S. Ignatov, E. T. A. Goffman: Lichnost'i Tvorchestvo (Moscow, 1914), p. 120.
21. The information given here relating to the works of Alexandre Dumas is derived from F. W. Reed, A Bibliography of Alexandre Dumas Père (Pinner Hill, 1933), p. 182.
22. Hoffmann, rather than any other Romantic writer, is chosen here to illuminate Bulgakov's work because at the end of the 1930's Bulgakov is known to have shown great interest in I. Mirimsky's article 'Sotsial'naya fantastika Gofmana' Literaturnaya ucheba 5 (Moscow, 1938), pp. 63-87. Bulgakov's interest is recorded by Chudakova in 'Uslovia sushchestvovaniya', pp. 79-81. E. Proffer remarks that at that stage Bulgakov's interest cannot be seen as 'influence, but rather recognition'. Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 479.
23. Ignatov, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
24. See this chapter, p. 144.
25. Ignatov, *op. cit.*, p. 116.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-8.
27. See chapter III, pp. 58-64.
28. P. Il'inskiy, 'O Mastere i Margarite' New Journal/Novyy zhurnal 138 (New York, 1980), p. 54: 'Так под названием "Бала у Сатаны" Булгаков с проницательностью Достоевского описывает сон психически неуравновешенной женщины, находящейся под действием какого-то наркотика (золотая коробочка Азazelло).'
29. Ignatov, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
30. Il'inskiy, *op. cit.*, p. 55: '[Булгаков] по-своему прав: мы живём одновременно и своим внешним, и своим внутренним миром; а сумма этих двух ... есть для нас реальная действительность.'
31. It is interesting to note that in his study Istoriya snosheniya cheloveka s d'yavolom (Moscow, 1904), M. A. Orlov makes reference to the popular idiom of the 'Kievan witch' ('ведьма киевская', p. 117), which he sees as stemming from the common belief that 'Лысая гора' near Kiev was a regular meeting place for witches, p. 36. Bulgakov, who came from Kiev, makes a witch the heroine of his novel; and 'Лысая гора' appears in it, not as a witches' meeting place, but as the location of the Jerusalem execution.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 183-5.
33. See this chapter, p. 144.
34. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 329.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 329.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. C. G. Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York, 1963), p. 329.
3. P. A. Kropotkin, Selected Writings on Anarchism and Revolution, edited with introduction by M. A. Miller (Massachusetts, 1970), section 213.
4. *Ibid.*, section 1.
5. *Ibid.*, section 1.
6. R. A. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, Foundations of Modern Political Science Series, (Yale University, 1970), p. 14; (quoted from The Dialogues of Plato, Jowett translation, Vol. II, p. 466.)
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-5. (Quoted from L. Strauss, Natural Right and History, p. 133.)
8. *Ibid.*, p. 15. (Quoted from Essays on Freedom and Power, edited by G. Himmelfarb, pp. 357 f.)
9. *Ibid.*, p. 15. (Quoted from Essays on Freedom and Power, edited by G. Himmelfarb, pp. 357 f.)
10. N. A. Berdyaev, Russkaya ideya (Paris, 1971), p. 149.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
13. F. M. Watkins, The Age of Ideology - Political Thought, 1750 to the Present, Foundations of Modern Political Science Series, (Yale University, 1964), p. 90.
14. P. C. Deck, Thematic Coherence in Bulgakov's 'Master i Margarita' (Ann Arbor, 1976), p. 158. (This information is derived by Deck from M. S. Enslin, Christian Beginnings, Parts I and II, pp. 62-3.)

15. *Ibid.*, p. 158. (This information is derived by Deck from M. S. Enslin, Christian Beginnings, Parts I and II, p. 67.)
16. The Brockhaus-Efron Encyclopedia Vol. XLVI, p. 595.
17. This corresponds to the way in which Woland enters into conversation with Berlioz and Bezdomny at the beginning of the novel: Woland shares the interest of the editor and young poet in atheism and powers of reason.
18. E. Renan, Zhizn' Iisusa (Berlin, 1885), p. 337. The Russian version of Renan's work is used primarily in this chapter which is concerned directly with the circumstances of the life of Jesus.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
20. Berdyaev, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
22. Renan, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-40.
23. In her article on 'Arkhir M. A. Bulgakova' Zapiski ot dela rukopisey, Vypusk 37 (Moscow, 1976), p. 72, M. O. Chudakova writes: '... автор собирал сведения о дне распятия Христа, разнообразные реалии (наименования иудейских должностей, точное местоположение Голгофы), пользуясь на этом этапе работы над романом каким-то из изданий "Жизни Иисуса" Э. Ренана и одной из книг Ф. В. Фаррапа ...' It must be emphasized that the purpose of this chapter is not to provide exhaustive evidence of the factual reality of the events surrounding Jeshua's execution. Rather, it is to discover the philosophical kernel of Bulgakov's novel and Renan's work serves as an invaluable aid in this process of discovery. For further information on Bulgakov's consultation of works on Christology and his relation to the historical and mythical schools which debated on the existence of Jesus Christ see E. Proffer, Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984) p. 551 and pp. 640-1. For information on background to the novel's Jerusalem chapters see G. El'baum, Analiz iudeyskikh glav 'Mastera i Margarity' M. Bulgakova (Ann Arbor, 1981) and A. Zerkalov, Evangelie Mikhaila Bulgakova (Ann Arbor, 1984).
24. Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-9.
27. It is necessary to note here that the founder of the Judas-sect has no connection with Judas of Karioth.
28. Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 330.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 341.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 21 and 362.
31. See this chapter, pp. 185 and 194.
32. It was claimed earlier that the ethics of nihilism also endow the individual with a certainty of moral judgement; however, it is not intuition (guidance from 'within') but 'utilitarian altruism' (ideology which the individual adopts from 'outside' himself) which ensures this certainty. See chapter I, pp. 31-3.
33. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
34. E. Renan, The Life of Jesus (London, 1927), the English version, p. 148.
35. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
36. See this chapter, p. 185.
37. Renan, *op. cit.*, the English version, p. 92.
38. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 329.
40. See preface, p. (vi).
41. Jung, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

NOTES TO THE CONCLUSION

1. See preface, p. (vi).
2. E. Proffer, Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 530.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 583.
4. E. Proffer, A Pictorial Biography of Bulgakov (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 112. (From Bulgakov's letter to P. S. Popov, April 14, 1932.)
5. See preface, p. (vi).

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

7

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography lists items cited in this thesis together with selected further items which have been consulted in connection with it. The arrangement of items within sections is alphabetical. The different editions of Master i Margarita which are used as primary sources in this thesis are given in the appropriate section of the bibliography. Since Bulgakov's other works are not discussed in this study reference to them is made by means of listing four bibliographies which provide a comprehensive coverage of Bulgakov's life and work as suggested by E. Proffer in Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984), p. 649.

1. Bibliographies on Bulgakov's life and work:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Hamant, Y. (comp.) | 'Bibliographie de Mihail Bulgakov' <u>Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique</u> , XI, 2 (1970), pp. 319-48. |
| Natov, N. (comp.) | 'A Bibliography of Works by and about Mikhail A. Bulgakov' <u>Canadian-American Slavic Studies</u> 15 (1981), pp. 457-65. |
| Proffer, E. (comp.) | <u>An International Bibliography of Works by and about Mikhail Bulgakov</u> (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976). |
| Wright, A. C. and
Curtis, J. (comps.) | 'A Partial Check-List of Bulgakov Materials in Soviet Archives' <u>Canadian-American Slavic Studies</u> 15 (1981), pp. 440-56. |

2. Works relating to the ideological background of Master i Margarita:

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Berdyayev, N.A. | <u>Russkaya ideya</u> (Paris, 1971). |
| _____. | 'Velikiy Inkvizitor' <u>Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii</u> Kniga I (86) (Moscow, 1907), pp. 1-36. |
| Bulgakov, Sergei | 'Bez plana' <u>Voprosy zhizni</u> 3 (St. Petersburg, 1905), pp. 388-414. |
| Davy, M.-M. | <u>Nicolas Berdyayev</u> , translated from the French by L. Siepmann (London, 1967). |

- Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar', (F. A. Brokgauz and I. A. Efron), 82 + 4 vols, I-VIII, edited by I. E. Andreevskiy (St. Petersburg, 1890-1891); IX-LXXXII, edited by K. K. Arsen'ev and F. F. Petrushevskiy (St. Petersburg, 1891-1904); 1-4 additional vols, edited by K. K. Arsen'ev and V. T. Shevyakov (St. Petersburg, 1905-1907).
- Frank, S. L. Iz istorii russkoy filosofskoy mysli kontsa XIX i nachala XX veka. Antologiya. (Washington, 1965).
- Mirsky, D. S. A History of Russian Literature, revised and edited by F. J. Whitfield (London, 1968).
- Pravoslavnaya bogoslovskaya entsiklopediya 10 vols. I-V, edited by A. P. Lopukhin (Petrograd, 1900-1904); VI-XII, edited by N. N. Glubokovskiy (St. Petersburg, 1905-1911).
- Solov'ev, V. S. Tri razgovora (New York, 1954).
- _____. Three Discussions. War, Progress and the End of History. Including a Short Story of the Anti-Christ, translated by A. Bakshy (London, 1915).
- _____. 'Samosoznanie ili samodovol'stvo?' Russkoe obozrenie Vol. 3 (Moscow, 1890), pp. 672-84.
- Vekhi: sbornik statey o russkoy intelligentsii N. A. Berdyaeva, S. N. Bulgakova, M. O. Gershenzona, A. S. Izgoeva, B. A. Kityakovskogo, P. B. Struve, S. L. Franka (Moscow, 1909).
- Volnyy 'Grekh intelligentsii' Grazhdanin No 51-2 (1909), pp. 2-3.
- Williams, N. P. The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: a Historical and Critical Study (London, 1927).
- Zenkovsky, V. V. A History of Russian Philosophy, translated by G. L. Kline, 2 vols, (London, 1953).
- Zernov, N. The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York, 1963).

3. All other works:

- Andreev, P. 'Besprosvet'e i prosvet (Fantasticheskie rassuzhdeniya o fantasticheskom romane)' Kontinent 22 (Berlin, 1980), pp. 349-365.
- Bergin, T. G. An Approach to Dante (London, 1965).
- Brown, E. J. Russian Literature Since the Revolution (New York, 1969).
- Bulgakov, M. A. Belaya gvardiya. Teatral'nyy roman. Master i Margarita. (Leningrad, 1978).
- _____. Dva pis'ma P. S. Popovu Glagol 2 (Ann Arbor, 1978), pp. 97-110.
- _____. The Master i Margarita, translated by M. Glenny (London, 1967).
- _____. Master i Margarita (Frankfurt/Main, 1974).
- _____. Saatana saapuu Moskovaan, (Satan arrives in Moscow), translated into Finnish by Ulla-Liisa Heino (Porvoo, 1969).
- Carew Hunt, R. N. The Theory and Practice of Communism (Harmondsworth, 1963).
- Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary, edited by A. M. Macdonald (Edinburgh, 1972).
- Chudakova, M. O. 'Arkhiy M. A. Bulgakova' Zapiski otdela rukopisey Vypusk. 37 (Moscow, 1976), pp. 25-151.
- _____. 'K tvorcheskoy biografii M. Bulgakova: 1916-1923' Voprosy literatury 7 (Moscow, 1973), pp. 231-55.
- _____. 'Tvorcheskaya istoriya romana M. Bulgakova Master i Margarita' Voprosy literatury 1 (Moscow, 1976), pp. 218-253.
- _____. 'Usloviye sushchestvovaniya' V mire knig 12 (Moscow, 1974), pp. 79-81.
- Daemmrich, H. S. The Shattered Self: E. T. A. Hoffmann's Tragic Vision (Detroit, 1973).
- Dahl, R. A. Modern Political Analysis, Foundations of Modern Political Science Series; R. A. Dahl (ed.) (Yale University, 1970).
- Dante The Divine Comedy, a new verse translation by C. H. Sisson (Manchester, 1980).

- Deck, P. C. Thematic coherence in Bulgakov's 'The Master and Margarita', Ph.D. dissertation, (Ann Arbor, 1976).
- Delaney, J. 'The Master and Margarita: the Reach exceeds the Grasp' Slavic Review 31, March (1972), pp. 89-100.
- Dostoevsky, F. M. Brat'ya Karamazovy (Petrozavodsk, 1970).
- El'baum, G. Analiz iudeyskikh glav 'Mastera i Margarity' M. Bulgakova (Ann Arbor, 1981).
- Enslin, M. S. Christian Beginnings, Parts I and II (New York, 1956).
- Florensky, P. A. Mnimosti v geometrii. Rasshirenije oblasti dvukhmernykh obrazov geometrii. (Moscow, 1922).
- Fordham, F. An Introduction to Jung's Psychology (Harmondsworth, 1966).
- Goethe Faust: A Tragedy, translated by W. Arndt and edited by C. Hamlin (New York, 1976).
- Gus, M. 'Goryat li rukopisi?' Znamya 12 (Moscow, 1968), pp. 213-220.
- Himmelfarb, G. (ed.) Essays on Freedom and Power (Boston, 1948).
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. Musikalische Novellen und Schriften, chosen and introduced by P. F. Scherber (Munich, n.d.).
- _____. Tales of Hoffmann, selected and translated with an introduction by R. J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth, 1982).
- Ignatov, S. S. E. T. A. Goffman. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo. (Moscow, 1914).
- Il'inskiy, P. 'O Mastere i Margarite' New Journal/Novyy zhurnal 138 (New York, 1980), pp. 51-65.
- Ingham, N. W. E. T. A. Hoffmann's Reception in Russia colloquium slavicum 6 (Würzburg, 1974).
- Jung, C. G. Memories, Dreams, Reflections, recorded and edited by A. Jaffé; translated from the German by R. and C. Winston (New York, 1963).
- Kovac, A. 'The Problem of Good and Evil in Bulgakov's novel The Master and Margarita' New Zealand Slavonic Journal (1968), pp. 26-34.
- Kovalevskiy, P. I. Iisus galileyandin (St. Petersburg, 1907).

- Krasnov, A. 'Khristos i master. O posmertnom romane M. Bulgakova Master i Margarita' Grani 71 May (1969), pp. 162-95; 72 July (1969), pp. 150-93; 73 October (1969), pp. 175-94.
- Kreps, M. Bulgakov i Pasternak kak romanisty (Ann Arbor, 1984).
- Kropotkin, P. A. Selection from his Writings, chosen by H. Read (London, 1942).
- _____. Selected Writings on Anarchism and Revolution, edited, with introduction, by M. A. Miller (Massachusetts, 1970).
- Lakshin, V. 'Roman M. Bulgakova Master i Margarita' Novyy mir 6 (Moscow, 1968), pp. 284-311.
- _____. 'Rukopisi ne goryat! Otvet Gusu.' Novyy mir 12 (Moscow, 1968), pp. 262-6.
- McGlathery, J. M. Mysticism and Sexuality: E. T. A. Hoffmann, Part One: Hoffmann and His Sources (Las Vegas, 1981).
- Mandel'stam, N. Ya. Vospominaniya (New York, 1970).
- _____. Vtoraya kniga (Paris, 1972).
- Milne, L. 'K biografii M. A. Bulgakova: Pis'ma I. V. Stalinu, A. M. Gor'komu, V. V. Veresaevu, P. S. Popovu i drugim' The New Review/Novyy zhurnal Kn. 111 (New York, 1973), pp. 151-174.
- _____. 'The Master and Margarita - a comedy of victory' Birmingham Slavonic Monographs No. 3 (Birmingham, 1977).
- Mirmimsky, I. 'Sotsial'naya fantastika Gofmana' Literaturnaya ucheba 5 (Moscow 1938), pp. 64-87.
- Mustangova, E. 'Mikhail Bulgakov. Kharakteristika literaturnogo tvorchestva.' Pechat' i revolyutsiya 4 (Moscow, 1927), pp. 81-7.
- Natov, N. (d.) 'Mikhail A. Bulgakov 1891-1981, special issue of Canadian-American Slavic Studies, Vol. 15, Nos. 2-3, Summer-Fall (Arizona, 1981).
- Nusinov, I. M. 'Put' M. Bulgakova' Pechat' i revolyutsiya 4 (Moscow, 1929), pp. 40-53.
- Orlov, N. A. Istoriya snosheniy cheloveka s d'yavolom (St. Petersburg, 1904).

Passage, C. E.

Dostoevski the Adapter: A Study in
Dostoevski's Use of the Tales of Hoffmann
University of North Carolina Studies in Com-
parative Literature 10 (Chapel Hill, 1954).

_____.

The Russian Hoffmannists (The Hague, 1963).

Plato

The Dialogues of Plato, Jowett translation
Vol. II (New York, 1937).

Proffer, E.

Bulgakov: Life and Work (Ann Arbor, 1984).

_____.

Neizdannyy Bulgakov: Teksty i materialy (Ann
Arbor, 1977).

_____.

A Pictorial Biography of Mikhail Bulgakov (Ann
Arbor, 1984).

Reed, F. W.

A Bibliography of Alexandre Dumas Père (Pinner
Hill, 1933).

Renan, E.

The Life of Jesus, with an introduction by C.
Gore; Everyman's Library, E. Rhys (ed.),
(London, 1927).

_____.

Zhizn' Iisusa (Berlin, 1885).

Slonim, M.

Soviet Russian Literature: Writers and Problems
1917-1967 (Oxford, 1967).

Strauss, L.

Natural Right and History (Chicago, 1953).

Vulis, A.

'Posleslovie' (to the first instalment of
Master i Margarita), Moskva XI (Moscow, 1966).

Wardman, H. W.

Ernest Renan: A Critical Biography (London,
1964).

Watkins, F. M.

The Age of Ideology - Political Thought, 1750
to the Present, Foundations of Modern
Political Thought Series; R. A. Dahl (ed.)
(Yale University, 1964).

Wright, A. C.

Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations
(Toronto, 1978).

Zamyatin, E. I.

My (New York, 1967).

Zerkalov, A.

Evangelie Mikhaila Bulgakova (Ann Arbor, 1984).

4. Miscellaneous:

Sinyavsky, A.

A public lecture given at Edinburgh University
on 23 February, 1984.